K. STEVE McCormick

c/R c/

Henry J. Thompson.
Oxford. 1851.

H J Bolt

Dail/4

K. STEVE McCormick

ECCLESIA ANGLICANA ECCLESIA CATHOLICA;

OR,

THE DOCTRINE
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
CONSONANT TO
SCRIPTURE, REASON, AND FATHERS:

IN

A DISCOURSE
UPON
THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES
AGREED UPON
IN THE CONVOCATION HELD AT LONDON MDLXII.

BY

WILLIAM BEVERIDGE, D. D.
LORD BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH.

THIRD EDITION.

OXFORD:
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
M.DCCC.XLVII.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE reader is now for the first time presented with an entire and authentic edition of Bishop Beveridge's Discourse on the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. For this he is indebted to the kindness of the Rev. Dr. Routh, president of Magdalen college, who purchased the original manuscript in the bishop's handwriting of Mr. Thomas Thorpe, the bookseller, about ten years since, together with another hitherto unpublished work by the same author, intituled, *Examen religionum, videlicet Ethnicæ Muhammedicæ Judaicæ et Christianæ.* Both these works Mr. Thorpe obtained in the year 1829 at the sale of the library of the Rev. Mr. Stanley, some time rector of Much Hadham, in the county of Hertford, who was a descendant of William Stanley, D. D. dean of St. Asaph, and also rector of Much Hadham, and whose aunt bishop Beveridge had married.

In the year 1716, eight years after the bishop's decease, Richard Smith, the bookseller, printed an incomplete edition, containing the comment on the first thirty articles only; complaining at the same time in his advertisement to the reader that he was unable to procure the remainder of the work. It should here be observed, that, besides the comment on the last nine articles never before printed, the MS. has authorized the introduction of several variations in the earlier part of the bishop's Discourse.

There is no evidence to shew at what particular period of the bishop's life this treatise was composed ; nor is the cause apparent why the author did not in his lifetime publish a work on which he has bestowed much care and learning. It is not unlikely, however, that as bishop Burnet, his contemporary, was known to be engaged in his Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, bishop Beveridge, with his characteristic modesty, kept back his own work, in deference to another who was engaged in the same pursuit. Bishop Burnet's work first appeared in 1699.

Oxford, Jan. 31, 1840.

ADVERTISEMENT

OF THE

BOOKSELLER TO THE READER,

Prefixed to the edition printed 1716.

AS in the titlepage this is said to be an Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, of which notwithstanding no more than the first thirty are here published, the reader will justly expect to be informed of the reason of it. The learned author has indeed left the Exposition actually finished, together with a Preface and Index to it; to which, with all his other manuscripts, I have an undoubted right, as any one may be satisfied that pleases to see the receipt I have under the hand of his executor. But the manuscript volume which contained the remaining part of this work, happening to fall into other hands, has been hitherto detained from me. I was not insensible of the hazard I was to run in publishing only a part of a book however excellent in itself; notwithstanding, this did not deter me from beginning, and now at last finishing all that I have at present of it. I have not been wanting in my endeavours to recover the rest, in order to make the book answer the title, and to publish it complete at once: however, as I do not yet wholly despair that the gentleman, who has the custody of it, may by some means be prevailed upon to resign it up to me; so proposing to publish it upon the same paper and print with this, and with the number of pages continued in order to complete the volume, I thought it most convenient to prefix the title of the whole to what the reader is now presented with. If what remains cannot be procured, then let this advertisement stand as an apology for the impropriety of the titlepage, and serve to inform posterity, that the author had taken the pains to complete this great work, however unjustly the world is deprived of the sight of part of it.

I found it was the general opinion of our learned men, that the attempts which some have already made upon this subject have not wholly superseded all farther endeavours upon it; and therefore made no doubt, that this new Essay would be kindly received, especially when known to be writ by an author of so great eminence for his profound learning and piety, and unquestionable zeal for the established Church. But because some pretended to make a question, whether the publishing of it would be for the honour of the author, and the common benefit; the best way I had to satisfy them, was to print such a part of it by way of specimen, as the world might from thence be able to form a judgment of the whole work. For this reason I published some of the first Articles by themselves, and was presently confirmed in my former opinion how well it was like to be received, both by the great impatience I every where found for the rest, and by the high recommendations given of it by the generality of learned men, as well with respect to the plain, modest, sincere and impartial manner in which it is writ, as for the happy application of the author's great learning and universal reading in it.

Whether the author had put his finishing hand to this work, I cannot pretend to determine; no doubt, however, but the edition of it would have been more correct and perfect had he lived to overlook it himself. But his deferring to publish it himself is unreasonably suggested by some as an argument against the worth of it, considering especially the author's great modesty, for which he was no less eminent than his piety and learning. Besides, if this were an argument, it would equally affect his other posthumous works I have published, which notwithstanding have met with an universal approbation.

As to what the same persons farther object, that this was one of the author's juvenile works, and therefore not fit for public view; I must confess I have no certain information what time he did write it. But I am much mistaken, if the author's known prudence and modesty would suffer him to undertake a work of so great importance, and so critical a nature, before he was arrived to a good maturity of years and judgment; and I leave the learned reader to judge, whether it is probable that so profound a knowledge of holy scriptures, fathers, councils, ecclesiastical and rabbinical writers, and oriental languages, as is every where discovered in this work, could be attained before the author was pretty well advanced in years. But granting that he did finish it in his youth, it must so much the more redound to his immortal honour, as it will speak him no less than a prodigy of parts and learning. At least, among competent judges, it will never be the worse received upon this score. We know that the late learned Bishop of Worcester's Origines Sacræ has not been the less esteemed, though published by the author when he was but four and twenty years of age.

By the specimens that have been already published of this work, I do not find that it has met with any opposition, but by such as are the known enemies of our Church; the doctrines of which are here, as I am well informed, so sincerely explained, and excellently confirmed. Notwithstanding they will find it hard to meet with any thing in this work that can justly provoke them, but many to cure them of their prejudices, and reconcile them. There is a peculiar strain of piety, seriousness, and charity, that runs through all this author's compositions, which cannot fail to affect those whom even his reasons cannot convince. Nor has this been without its good effects upon many people's minds already; insomuch that we can upon good grounds say, that the opportune publishing of the writings of this great prelate has put no small stop to that torrent of profaneness and infidelity so much complained of. And therefore any attempts to lessen their value can never be thought to be made for the service of religion; especially when the only objection that the most malicious have been able to find out against them, is in respect to some pretended defects in the style and manner of expression. For granting that he may in some few places, even of this book, abound in turns and antitheses, this is known by the learned to be so much the style of many of the primitive fathers, that his close imitating of them in piety and orthodoxy will easily excuse his imitating them in this also. But in short, the Bishop had higher views than to please those who look no deeper than into the style of an author: his business was to inform the judgment, and not to please the fancy; and he writ for those who read with a sincere disposition to be informed, and not for those who have been always known to endeavour to destroy the credit of every thing that tends to promote piety.

How much soever it may have been the interest and concern of some to hinder the publishing of this work, I am very confident the learned world, who have seen the first Article, would have been very sorry to have lost the opportunity of perusing the rest. His other writings, which have rendered his name famous over all Europe, have caused every composition of his to be earnestly desired. It scarce would have been believed that this work, which is rather of greater, certainly not of less importance than any of his other writings, and upon which he has visibly bestowed so much pains, was not worthy of public view. To have suppressed it would have rather been an injury to his memory than otherwise; and would have been taken, as if so great and pious a man had to no purpose employed so great a part of his time, of which no person was known to be a better husband.

Though I have endeavoured as much as I could to render the edition of this book correct; yet, through the hurry of the press, occasioned by the great impatience for it, I am sensible some errors, and those not merely literal, have passed uncorrected. I desire the candid reader to lay these to the charge of the printer, and by no means to the author; and when the rest of the work comes forth, I promise that the most considerable of them shall be taken notice of by way of errata.

THE

PREFACE TO THE READER.

NO sooner were the boisterous storms of persecution raised by Rome heathen against the church of Christ allayed by the goodness of the great God, but Constantine, that renowned emperor, forthwith gathered together all the bishops of the Christian world into a council at Nice, a city in Bithynia, to end the controversies that were then on foot, and to settle one faith and truth to be acknowledged and professed by the universal church. In like manner, when those fiery persecutions, kindled and blown up by the same Rome, now papal, in the days of Queen Mary, against the church of Christ in this nation, were once blown out by the breath of the Most High, our gracious Queen Elizabeth, of ever blessed memory, for the establishing consent touching true religion, called the bishops and clergy of both provinces of this nation into a council, held at London, an. Dom. 1562, where they agreed upon certain Articles of religion, to the number of thirty-nine, which to this day remain the constant and settled doctrine of our church; which, by an act of parliament of the 13th of Queen Elizabeth, an. Dom. 1571, all that are entrusted with any ecclesiastical preferments are bound to subscribe to, and which have been several times since that ratified and confirmed by several proclamations and declarations, set forth by King James and King Charles the First of ever blessed memory, as also by our most gracious sovereign that now is. And last of all, in the late act for uniformity, 14 Carol. II, subscription is again required to them.

Now these are the Articles which are the subject of this following Discourse, wherein I have not undertaken to expound any doubtful and ambiguous phrases we may meet with in them, but taking each Article in its most usual literal and grammatical sense, I have endeavoured to prove the scope and substance of it to be a real truth in itself, which we are bound to believe, and by consequence to subscribe to when required by authority.

The method I propounded to myself in this Discourse, was first to shew that each Article for the sum and substance of it is grounded upon the scriptures, so that if it be not expressly contained in them, howsoever it may by good and undeniable consequence be deduced from them. Having shewn it to be grounded upon the scriptures, I usually prove it to be consonant to right reason too, even such a truth, that though scripture did not, reason itself would command us to believe it. And lastly, for the further confirmation of it, I still shew each article to be believed and acknowledged for a truth by the Fathers of the primitive church, that so we may see how though in many things we differ from others and from the present church of Rome, yet we recede not in any thing from the primitive and more unspotted church of Christ. These are the three heads I ordinarily insist upon, still keeping that excellent passage of [a] St. Augustine in my mind: "No sober man will think or hold an opinion against reason, no Christian against the scripture, and no lover of peace against the church." And therefore, seeing all these Articles are grounded upon scripture, assented to by reason, and delivered by the primitive as well as the present church, he must be no sober Christian, nor peaceable man that sets himself against them.

And in speaking unto these heads, and so through the whole work, I have endeavoured so to order and contrive it, that such as are not skilled in the learned languages may read and understand the sum and substance of it without any disturbance or interruption, and therefore I have not inserted any sentences or phrases of Latin, Greek, or Hebrew, or any other language with our English, into the body of the book, but whatsoever Father or other author I quote, I translate what I so cite out of him into our own language, not tying myself to render every thing word by word, but only to give the substance of that in our language which they delivered in others. But, howsoever, to prevent those frivolous cavils that are sometimes made against translations, as also for the ease and satisfaction of intelligent readers, whatsoever testimonies of the Fathers I produce in the body of the book, I have still set down in the margent their own words, in their own language which they wrote in, such of the Greek Fathers excepted which we have only the Latin translations of. And though in the body of the book there is nothing delivered but in our own vulgar language, yet in the margent, besides the several places of scripture explained out of the oriental languages, I have all along alleged the testimonies of the Fathers for the further explanation and confirmation of what is there delivered, not stuffing the margent with any quotations of modern writers, but only of the Fathers, unless it be in shewing the doctrine of the present church of Rome, which some of the Articles necessarily require. And in my quotations of the Fathers I am still careful not to refer the reader only to such or such places of their writings, (which sort of references I sometimes find multiplied to little or no purpose,) but to set down their words at length, which maketh that the margent sometimes swells bigger than the text itself. And in my quotations of St. Chrysostome especially, because he is so voluminous, I often cite the tome and page, viz. of Sir Henry Savile's edition; which I here note particularly, because in the book I seldom mention the edition I made use of. And I have endeavoured so to order it, that in one place or other in the book, either in the text or margent, we may see the judgment of the primitive church upon most of the principal heads of our Christian religion.

---

[a] Contra rationem nemo sobrius, contra scripturas nemo Christianus, contra ecclesiam nemo pacificus senserit.—August. de Trin. l. iv. c. 6.

And because for the right understanding of discourses of this nature it is very requisite to know the several ages or times wherein the Fathers cited are supposed to have lived and the councils to have been celebrated, I have at the end of the book set down a catalogue of the Fathers, councils, and other ancient authors made use of in this book, together with the several times and places wherein they flourished. Thus desiring that the most high God would be pleased so to order it, that what I have done by his strength may make for his glory and our church's good, by helping towards the reconciling of her enemies to, and the confirming her children in those sacred truths, I commit both thee and it into his hands, who alone can lead us into all truth; without whose blessing the greatest works will be unsuccessful, whereas with it the least shall be beneficial.

A DISCOURSE

UPON

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

ARTICLE I.

OF THE HOLY TRINITY.

There is but one living and true God.

THAT there is some such Being in and over the world, which we in English call *God*, is not here made a distinct article of our faith in England, because it is an article of faith in all nations through the whole world: there being no [a] language so barbarous but it hath some word or other signifying the same thing in it; nor any [b] people so atheistical as not to acknowledge and worship the thing signified by it. Nay, rather than err on one hand in worshipping no God at all, most err on the other hand in worshipping more than [b] one: there being no nation but worships some God, some nations worship many. Hence, I say, it is, that, in the determining of the distinct and fundamental articles of faith professed by our church of England, it would have been altogether superfluous to have made the existence of a Deity any of them; that being no more than what is undoubtedly acknowledged in all nations, and necessarily supposed in all religions; and so in this of ours also: for in that it is a religion, or a special and peculiar manner of performing worship to God, it must needs suppose there is some God to whom such worship is to be performed. And in this sense, the existence of a Deity, as the foundation of all religion, is necessarily implied in every one of these ensuing articles; and therefore also it need not be made a distinct article of itself.

---

[a] The Sclavonian tongue expresseth the same thing by *Buch*, the Panonian by *Istu*, the French by *Dieu*, the Italian by *Dio* and *Iddio*, the Polonian by *Buog*, the Egyptians by *Teut*, the Spanish by *Dios*, the German by *Gott*, the Belgic by *Godt*, the Magi by *Orsi*, &c. And as for the learned languages, the Latin *Deus*, the Greek Θεὸς, the Hebrew יְהֹוָה *Jehovah*, and אֱלֹהִים *Elohim*, the Chaldee אֱלָהּ *Elah*, and אֱלָהָא *Elaha*, the Syriac ܐܠܗܐ *Aloho*, and ܡܪܝܐ *Morio*, the Arabic الٰه *Ilahon*, and الله *Allaho*, the Ethiopic አምላክ *Amlac*, and እግዚአብሔር *Egziabcher*, the Samaritan ࠀࠋ *El*, and ࠀࠋࠄ *Elah*, and the Persic خدا *Choda*, all signify the same thing that our word *God* doth; neither was there ever any language found out that hath not some word or other equivalent to it.

[b] *Πάντες γὰρ ὅτι ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς ὁμολογοῦσι κοινῇ ἐννοίᾳ.* Just. Quæst. et resp. ad Græc. [I. i.] *Καὶ ἑνὶ λόγῳ, κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ δήμους, θυσίας κατάγουσιν, ἃς ἂν ἐθέλωσιν ἄνθρωποι, καὶ μυστήρια. οἱ δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ αἰλούρους, καὶ κροκοδείλους, καὶ ὄφεις, καὶ ἀσπίδας καὶ κύνας, Θεοὺς νομίζουσι· καὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν ἐπιτρέπετε καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ οἱ νόμοι· τὸ μὲν οὖν μηδ᾽ ὅλως Θεὸν ἡγεῖσθαι, ἀσεβὲς καὶ ἀνόσιον νομίσαντες· τὸ δὲ, οἷς ἕκαστος βούλεται χρῆσθαι ὡς Θεοῖς, ἀναγκαῖον· ἵνα τῷ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον δέει, ἀπέχωνται τοῦ ἀδικεῖν.* Athenag. legat. pro Christ. init. [I.]

Supposing therefore the existence of a Deity, this the first part of this first article only expresseth the unity of that Deity that doth exist. The first hath been acknowledged by all; the second denied by many heretofore; yea, and now too, though not amongst us, yet in other parts of the world, as in Africa and America, where they worship sun, moon, stars and other creatures, yea, have almost as many gods worshipped by men as there are men to worship them; every one, according to his own fancy, framing to himself a Deity, and then performing worship to it. To keep out therefore such extravagant fancies from amongst us, it is here set down as the foundation of all our fundamental articles, that there is but "one living and true God:" where we also have not only our one God opposed to their many, but differenced from every one of them. They have many, but they are all dead and false gods; we have but one, but he is the living and the true God. The living God, who hath life both in and from himself; who is not only the abyss of life in himself, but the fountain of life to us; who lives upon nothing but himself, and hath all things living upon himself; yea, who is so the living God, as to be life itself: so that it cannot be so

[b] *all* MS.

properly said, that he hath life, as that he is life; life to himself, and life to all living creatures. What we [c] have is really distinguished from what we are. And therefore when we speak of God, in whom there is no distinction of one perfection from another, or of any of them from himself, we speak more agreeably to his nature, and more conformably to his truth, when we say he is, rather than hath such a perfection; he is wisdom, he is power, he is goodness, he is justice, and so, he is [d] life itself: especially when we consider, that he is usually and truly apprehended as the most pure and simple act; which exactly answers the right notion of that which we term *life.*

And our God being thus the living, he must needs be the true God. Many of the heathens, I confess, worshipped living creatures, which notwithstanding were false gods; not because living, but because creatures, and therefore so living, as not to live of themselves, much less to be life itself, but to derive it from another: and so the borrowed life of theirs could speak them no more than false gods; but the uncreated, original life of ours proclaims him to be the true God. Where the words *true God* are not to be extended so far as to signify a God of truth, but only in truth a God: though that other is necessarily included in this; for he that is in truth a God must needs be a God of truth, truth being a perfection, and so necessarily required to the right notion of a Deity. And thus it is that *there is but one living and true God*, and therefore true, because living: and *that there is but one living and true God* is a truth grounded upon scripture, agreeable to reason, and taught by the fathers long ago.

---

[c] Tu aliud es, aliud habes. Verbi gratia, habes sapientiam: numquid tu es Sapientia? Denique quia non es tu ipse quod habes, si amiseris quod habes, reddis ut non habeas: et aliquando resumis, aliquando amittis. Quomodo oculus noster non in seipso habet inseparabiliter lucem, aperitur et capit, clauditur et amittit. Non sic Deus Dei Filius, non sic est Verbum Patris: sic habet sapientiam, ut ipse sit Sapientia, faciatque sapientes: sic habet vitam, ut sit ipse Vita, faciatque viventes. Aug. [vol. III. par. II.] in Joh. Tract. 48. [6.]

[d] Quoniam Deus vita est et incorruptela et veritas. Irenæus, adv. Hæres. l. 2. c. 18. [II. 13. 9.] Deus est summa Vita, et summa Sapientia, et summa Dilectio. Quantum ergo vita vivit, tantum intelligit et tantum se diligit. Si enim non tantum se intelligit quantum vivit, nequaquam summa Sapientia erit; et si non tantum se diligit quantum se intelligit, summa Dilectio minime existit. Aug. [vol. VI.] de cognit. veræ vitæ, [Append.] c. 19: and thus he attributes other perfections also to him in the abstract; as, Et hæc Trinitas unus est Deus solus, bonus, magnus, æternus, omnipotens: ipse sibi Unitas, Deitas, Magnitudo, Bonitas, Omnipotentia. Id. de temp. serm. 38. [Alcuin. de Trin. I. 6.] Nefas autem est dicere, ut subsistat et subsit Deus bonitati suæ, atque illa bonitas non substantia sit vel potius essentia, neque ipse Deus sit bonitas sua, sed in illo sit tanquam in subjecto. Id. de Trinit. l. 7. c. 5. [vol. VIII. l. vii. 10.]

First for scripture. And truly to find out scripture to prove this truth I need not turn over many leaves, for there is scarce a page that I can cast mine eye upon in my first opening of the Bible, but would furnish me with sufficient arguments for it. But I shall content myself with these three or four of the most prevalent and convincing. The first place is that, [e] *Hear, O Israel, The Lord our God is one God*, Deut. vi. 4: where we may plainly see, that that God, whom Israel, and so we are bound to worship, is no more than one. But because this place hath been impugned by several heretics in the church, as Valentinus, Basilides, and others, affirming it to import no more than one in will and one in heart, as the multitude of believers are said to be, Acts iv. 32; so, say they, though there be many gods, yet they all agree in one, and so may be said to be one, as *he that planteth and he that watereth* is said to be *one*, 1 Cor. iii. 8; because this place, I say, hath been so eluded, I shall produce others, upon which it is impossible to force such a distinction: as, *Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above and upon earth beneath: and there is none else.* Deut. iv. 39. Where we see it is expressly avouched, that the Lord Jehovah is the only God, besides whom there is no other God in heaven or earth, and so in no place in the world.

---

[e] In Hebrew it is שמע ישראל יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד in which words the Jews observe there be two *literæ majusculæ*, viz. ע at the end of שמע and ד at the end of אחד; as for the first, viz. ע, they say it was made greater than the other letters, to put us more in mind of the great truth we are there taught and commanded to hearken to; and as for the second, viz. ד (that makes for our purpose), they say it is made larger to shew that there is but one God in all the four quarters of the world, and so no other God in heaven or earth, or any part of the world, but only Jehovah: for ד in Hebrew numbers makes four; and both these letters being put together, as they here stand, viz. first ע and then ד, they make up the word עד *a witness;* as if he should say, *The Lord is a witness against you*, as Mic. i. 2. or, *You are witnesses unto me*, as Isai. xliii. 10. that the Lord our God is but one God.

And therefore he is not only one in will, but one in nature: there is no other God besides him, to be of the same will with him. And to the same purpose it is elsewhere asserted, *I am the Lord, there is none else, there is no God besides me.* Isa. xlv. 5. So that Valentinus may assert, and the heathens may worship many deities, but the Lord hath spoken it, and the scriptures affirm it, that there is no God besides Jehovah: and that not only in the places cited, but others also, as Deut. xxxii. 39; Isa. xliv. 6, 8; ch. xlv. 21, 22; Mal. ii. 10. And what the Old Testament asserts, the New Testament confirms, that there is none other God but one, 1 Cor. viii. 4; who is the living and the true God. 1 Thess. i. 9; Jer. x. 10.

Neither is this so high a mystery as to be out of the sight of reason, and therefore only to be embraced by faith: for if we consult our reason, as we have done the scriptures, we shall find that as clear in concluding, as this is express in affirming of this truth. Indeed there is scarce an argument can be produced to prove the existence of a Deity, but may easily be brought over to prove the unity of that Deity also that doth exist. So that the same weapons that reason useth to beat down atheism, she may use also in her conflicts with polytheism: there is no god, and there are many gods, being propositions of the like absurdity in her account.

The usual reason that is brought for the existence of a Deity is taken from the order of causes: to wit, because there must be some [f] one cause of all causes, which is the first cause of all other things, itself being caused by nothing, without which all causes would run in a circle, and never come to an end, but must pass from one to another even into infinitude itself: which reason looks upon as the greatest absurdity in the world: for then there would be eternal changes and motions within the narrow compass of time, and finite causes would have no end, and so become infinite: which being a plain contradiction, I need not bring any arguments to prove its further absurdity; but, from the undeniable order and dependence of all causes upon one, must conclude, that there must be such an universal first cause, upon which all the rest must thus depend. And truly this argument proves as much, that there can be no more than one, as that there must be one such universal cause, which we call *God*. It being as great an absurdity to say there are many, as to say there is never a first cause. For, supposing many universal causes, either one must be before another, or one must not be before another. If one be not before another, none of them is the first cause, because there be others of equal causality with itself: if one be still before another, one of them must needs be before all the rest, and it is he alone that can be called the First Cause, because all the rest come after him.

---

[f] Ab uno desuper Principio, quod convenienter voluntati operatur, dependent prima, secunda, et tertia. Clem. Alex. Stromat. l. 7. [vol. II. p. 833. 40.]

If after this we take a view of those perfections, which reason certainly concludes to be all concentred in the Deity, we shall clearly see, it is impossible they should be in more than one: so that to say they are in many, would be as much as to say they are in none at all. As first, supremacy, which is a perfection whereby we apprehend God as being the supreme Governor over all the world: which if he be not, our reason will not suffer us to call him *God;* nothing coming under the notion of a Deity, but what is above all other things whatsoever. Now if there should be many gods, either all of them should be equal to one another, or else one above another, as I said before. If they be all equal to one another, there is never a superior, much less a supreme amongst them, and so never a one that in reason can be termed a *God;* they all wanting the great perfection of supremacy or sovereignty over all the world. If they be all one above another, there must be one above all the other; and it is he alone that can be called *God:* and what we here say concerning supremacy in power, may be applied also to supremacy in greatness, goodness, or any other perfection: for there can be but one [g] chief good, and by consequence but one God.

---

[g] This is the argument which I find Anselme, archbishop of Canterbury, elegantly deducing the unity of the Godhead from. Quod autem, saith he, Unus solus sit Deus, et non plures, hinc facile probatur; quia aut Deus non est summum bonum, aut sunt plura summa bona, aut non sunt plures Dii, sed unus solus. Deum vero summum bonum esse nemo negat; quia, quicquid aliquo minus est, nullatenus Deus est,

Again, infinitude in general is also a perfection, which reason cannot but attribute to God, and to none but God, whereby we apprehend him as without bounds and limits of his nature and glory; which it is impossible for any more than one to be. For if one be without bounds, and so every where[h], where can any other be, especially how can any other be without bounds and every where too? Or more plainly, supposing two Gods, one essentially distinct from the other, where one of them is, the other also either is or is not: if the other be where that one is, then they are both together, and so their natures and glories confounded, and by consequence they are not essentially distinct Gods; if the other be not where that one is, then it hath bounds and limits to its nature and glory, there being somewhere where his nature and glory is not; and therefore he cannot be termed infinite, and consequentially he is no God.

Again, omnipotence is also a perfection, whereby God is not only infinite in nature, but in power, and so able to do whatsoever in its own nature doth not imply a contradiction,

---

et quicquid summum bonum non est, minus est aliquo, quia minus est summo bono. Summum certe bonum pluralitatem sui non admittit, ut plura sint summa bona. Si enim plura sunt summa bona, paria sunt. Summum ergo bonum est, quod sic præstat aliis bonis, ut nec par habeat, nec præstantius. Summum ergo bonum unum et solum est; non igitur sunt plures Dii, sed unus et solus est Deus. Sicut summum bonum est unum et solum, sic summa substantia, vel essentia, sive natura, quæ eadem ratione, qua summa, nullatenus pluraliter dici posse probantur. Anselm. de incarnat. Verbi c. 4. [p. 85. D.] And long before him Tertullian; Duo ergo summa magna quomodo consistent, cum hoc sit summum magnum par non habere? par autem non habere, uni competat, in duobus esse nullo modo possit. Adv. Marcion. l. I. [c. 3.] Deum autem unum esse oportet: quia quod summum sit, Deus est: summum autem non erit, nisi quod unicum fuerit. Id. adv. Herm. [c. 4.] Porro summum magnum unicum sit necesse est: ergo et Deus unicus erit: non aliter Deus, nisi summum magnum: nec aliter summum nisi parem non habens: nec aliter parem non habens, nisi unicus fuerit. Id. advers. Marc. lib. I. [c. 3.] prius cit.

[h] Ποῦ δὲ καὶ ἔσται ὁ κατ᾽ αὐτοὺς θεὸς, τὰ ταῦτα τοῦ μόνου καὶ ἀληθινοῦ πληροῦντος κατὰ τὴν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς περίληψιν; Athanas. Orat. contra gentes, [6.] Εἰ δύο ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἢ πλείους ἦσαν θεοὶ, ἤτοι ἐν ἑνὶ καὶ ταυτῷ ἦσαν, ἢ ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστος αὐτῶν. ἐν μὲν οὖν ἑνὶ καὶ ταυτῷ εἶναι οὐκ ἠδύναντο, οὐ γὰρ εἰ θεοὶ, ὅμοιοι· ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἀγένητοί τε καὶ γενητοὶ, οὐχ ὅμοιοι.—εἰ δὲ ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστου αὐτῶν ὄντος, τοῦ τὸν κόσμον πεποιηκότος, ἀνωτέρω τῶν γεγονότων καὶ περὶ ἃ ἐποίησέ τε καὶ ἐκόσμησε, ποῦ ὁ ἕτερος, ἢ οἱ λοιποί; εἰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν κόσμος σφαιρικὸς ἀποτελεσθεὶς, οὐρανοῦ κύκλοις ἀποκέκλεισται, ὁ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου Ποιητὴς ἀνωτέρω τῶν γεγονότων ἐπέχων αὐτὸν τῇ τούτων προνοίᾳ, τὶς ὁ τοῦ ἑτέρου θεοῦ ἢ τῶν λοιπῶν τόπος; Athenag. Leg. pro Christianis, [8.]

or is possible to be done by any power. Now it is impossible there should be two essentially distinct persons endowed with this perfection. For, supposing two such persons, what one doth will easily be granted to be possible, in its own nature, to be done; for otherwise he could not do it: but though it be possible in itself, yet is it impossible for the other supposed God to do it: for then there would be two whole and perfect causes of the same kind to one effect; which is a contradiction: for then one would be wholly the cause, and yet not wholly the cause, because there is another, that is as much the cause as itself. And therefore there can be no more than one such person invested with this perfection of [i] Omnipotence, and so but one God. And if we do suppose several Gods of the greatest power imaginable, every one of them must needs have less power than all together, and by consequence not all power in his own hands: and that being that hath not all power is no All-powerful being, and therefore no God.

But I needed not to have gone so far to have proved there are some perfections which it is impossible for many essentially distinct persons to be possessed of: for indeed unity itself is a perfection, which whosoever saith more than one can have at the same time, gives himself the lie. For if they be many essentially distinct Gods, how can they all be but one? And therefore whatsoever other perfections many Gods may have, be sure this they must want, upon that very account, because they are many: and so cannot be all perfectly Gods, because not perfect Gods, wanting some perfection which God must have, or not be God: and therefore, I conclude even from reason, that seeing in the order of causes there must be one, and but one first cause; and seeing there can be no more than one Being absolutely supreme, infinite, omnipotent, and one, "There is but one living and true God."

---

[i] This argument from omnipotence Lactantius long ago made use of. Quis dubitet potentissimum esse regem, qui totius orbis habeat imperium? neque immerito: cum illius sint, quæ ubique sunt omnia: cum ad eum solum omnes undique copiæ congerantur. At si plures partiuntur orbem: minus certe opum, minus virium singuli habebunt, cum intra præscriptam portionem se quisque contineat. Eodem etiam modo Dii, si plures sint, minus valebunt, aliis tantundem in se habentibus. Virtutis autem perfecta natura non potest esse nisi in eo in quo totum est, non in eo in quo pars exigua de toto est. Deus vero, si perfectus est, (nam perfectus est,) ut esse debet, non potest esse, nisi unus, ut in eo sint omnia. Lactant. de falsa relig. c. 3. [p. 10.] Nemo est quidem qui sapiat rationemque secum putet qui non unum esse intelligat, qui et condiderit omnia, et eadem, qua condidit, virtute moderetur. Quid enim multis opus est ad mundi regimen sustinendum? Nisi forte arbitremur, si plures sint, minus habere singulos nervorum atque virium. Quod quidem faciunt ii, qui esse multos volunt: quia necesse est, imbecilles esse: siquidem singuli sine auxilio reliquorum tantæ molis gubernaculum sustinere non possent. Deus autem, qui est æterna mens, ex omni utique parte perfectæ consummatæque virtutis est. Quod si verum est; unus sit, necesse est. *Ibid.* [p. 9.]

And this was the doctrine which the fathers of old taught. I shall instance but only in some: as first Tertullian: [k]"But the Christian truth strictly saith, God, if he be not one, he is none: for whatsoever is not as it ought to be, we think better of it, if we believe it not to be. But that thou mayest know that God should be but one, inquire what God is, and thou wilt find it cannot be otherwise. As far as the human state can define any thing of God, I assert, what every one's conscience also acknowledgeth, that God is the chief and highest Being in the world, eternal, unbegotten, unmade, without beginning, without end. Therefore he must needs be one only, because he is the chiefest, not having an equal, lest he should not be the chiefest." And before him Ignatius: [l]"Therefore God and the Father is but one, not two or three; he being one, and there is none besides him, the alone true God. For, *The Lord*, saith he, *thy God is one Lord.* And again, did not one God make us? have not we all one Father?" And Justin Martyr tells us, that, [m]"According to those, who by learning know the difference betwixt God and a creature, there is but one God, unbegotten, according to both the manners of unbegetting, who hath not any gods either before or after himself, having none coeternal with himself, none subject or opposite to him, having an incorruptible nature and irresistible power, himself being the maker of the whole world." And Athenagoras to the same purpose: [n] "But all our discourse is only to shew that there is but one God, the maker of the universe, who himself being not made (for that which is, is not made, but that which is not) he made all things by his word." St. Cyprian: [o] "Therefore there is one God, Lord of all; for his highness cannot have an equal, seeing himself hath all power in his own hand." And presently: [p] "The bees have one king, the flocks one captain, and the herds one leader, much more hath the world but only one Governor, who commandeth all things with his word, dispenseth all things with his wisdom, and perfecteth all things by his power. He cannot be seen, he is more clear than sight; nor comprehended, he is more pure than touch; nor valued, for he is beyond all sense: and therefore we so worthily esteem of him to be God, when we think him inestimable." And Ruffinus not only tells us that, but shews us how God is said to be one: [q] "But that which we said that the Eastern churches deliver, that the Father is omnipotent, and only one

---

[k] Sed veritas Christiana destricte pronunciavit: Deus, si non unus est, non est: quia dignius credimus non esse, quodcunque non ita fuerit ut esse debebit. Deum autem ut scias unum esse debere, quære quid sit Deus, et non aliter invenies. Quantum humana conditio de Deo definire potest, id definio, quod et omnium conscientia agnoscet: Deum, summum esse magnum, in æternitate constitutum, innatum, infectum, sine initio, sine fine.—Ergo unicum sit necesse est, quod fuerit summum magnum, par non habendo, ne non sit summum magnum. Tertull. adv. Marcion. lib. 1. [c. 3.]

[l] Εἷς οὖν Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ, καὶ οὐ δύο, οὐδὲ τρεῖς. Εἷς ὁ ὢν, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ πλὴν αὐτοῦ, ὁ μόνος ἀληθινός. Κύριος γὰρ, φησὶν, ὁ Θεός σου, Κύριος εἷς ἐστι. Καὶ πάλιν, οὐχ εἷς Θεὸς ἔκτισεν ἡμᾶς; οὐχ εἷς πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν; Ignat. Epist. ad Philip. [Inter. Theol. Gr. vet. Gesner. 1559. p. 12.]

[m] Καὶ κατ᾽ ἐκείνους μὲν τοὺς ἐκ διδασκαλίας Θεοῦ, καὶ κτίσεως ἐγνωκότας τὴν διαφορὰν, εἷς ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς, καθ᾽ ἑκάτερον τὸν τῆς ἀγεννησίας τρόπον ἀγέννητος ὢν. Θεὸν δὲ ἢ Θεοὺς οὔτε πρὸ αὐτοῦ οὔτε μετ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐσχηκὼς, συναΐδιον οὐκ ἔχων οὔτε ὑποκείμενον οὔτε ἀντικείμενον, ἄφθαρτον ἔχων τὴν οὐσίαν, καὶ ἀνεμπόδιστον τὴν ἐνέργειαν, δημιουργὸς ὢν τοῦ κόσμου παντός. Justin. Martyr. in Aristot. Dogmat. evers. [init. C.]

---

[n] *Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ἕνα Θεὸν ἄγει, τὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς ποιητὴν, αὐτὸν μὲν οὐ γενόμενον (ὅτι τὸ ὂν οὐ γίνεται ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ ὂν) πάντα δὲ διὰ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγου πεποιηκότα.* Athenag. *περὶ Χριστιανῶν*, [4.]

[o] Unus igitur omnium Dominus Deus: neque enim illa sublimitas potest habere consortem, cum sola omnem teneat potestatem. Cyprian. de idolorum vanitate, [p. 14.]

[p] Rex unus est apibus, et dux unus in gregibus, et in armentis rector unus: multo magis mundi unus est rector, qui universa, quæcunque sunt, verbo jubet, ratione dispensat, virtute consummat. Hic enim videri non potest, visu clarior est: nec comprehendi, tactu purior est: nec æstimari, sensu major est; et ideo sic eum digne æstimamus, dum inæstimabilem dicimus. *Ib.* And Minutius Felix in his Octavius doth not only use the same arguments, but the same words too. Whence we may gather, that one had not only seen, but borrowed from the other: and it is probable Cyprian from Minutius, who was about thirty years his senior.

[q] Quod autem diximus orientis ecclesias tradere patrem omnipotentem et unum Dominum, hoc modo intelligendum est; unum non numero dici, sed universitate. Verbi gratia. Si quis dicit unum hominem, aut unum equum, hic unum pro numero posuit; potest enim et alius homo esse, et tertius, vel equus. Ubi autem secundus, vel tertius non potest jungi, unus si dicatur, non numeri, sed universitatis est nomen.

Lord, it is to be understood after this manner; one, not in numbers but in universality. As for example, if one should say, one man, or one horse, here he puts one for a number, for there may be another man and a third; and so for one horse too: but where a second or third cannot be added, if any thing be called one, that doth not denote number, but universality: as for example, if we should say, one sun; that is so called one, that a second or third cannot be added: the sun is one. Much more when God is called one, *one* is a word, not of number, but universality; that is, he is therefore called *one*, because there is no other. And so we must think also of our Lord, that there is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the Father governs all things; so that God is so one, as no one besides him is: he is so one God, as that there is not, there cannot be another God besides him." And therefore saith Tertullian also [r]: "The state of the one only God challengeth this rule, no otherwise one, than because alone, nor otherwise alone, than because there is nothing with him." Shall I thrust in a learned rabbi amongst these reverend fathers? Moses Maimonides speaks fully to the purpose [s]: "This God is one, not two nor more than two; but one, whose unity is not like that of the ones or individuals that are found in the world; nor one by way of species containing several individuals under it; nor one, as a body is, which may be divided into several parts or extremities; but he is so one, as that there is no one in the world so one as he is." And it is one of the articles of the Jews' faith, [t] "I verily believe that the

---

Ut si, exempli causa, dicamus unum solem, hic unus ita dicitur, ut alius vel tertius addi non possit: unus est sol. Multo magis Deus, cum unus dicitur, non numeri, sed universitatis vocabulo nuncupatur, id est, qui propterea unus dicitur, quod alius non sit. Similiter, et de Domino accipiendum est, quod unus sit Dominus noster Jesus Christus, per quem Deus pater Dominatum omnium tenet. Ruffin. in exp. symb. [ad calc. Cypriani opp. p. 18. Oxon. 1682.]

[r] Unici Dei status hanc regulam vindicat; non aliter unici, nisi quia solius, nec aliter solius, nisi quia nihil cum illo. Tertull. adv. Herm. c. 17.

[s] אלוה זה אחד הוא ואינו לא שנים ולא יותר על שנים אלא אחד שאין כייחודה אחד מן האחדים הנמצאים בעולם׳ לא אחד במין שהוא כולל אחדים הרבה ולא אחד בגוף שהוא נחלק למחלקות ולקצוות אלא אחד שאין ייחוד אחד כמותו בעולם R. Mosch. bar Maimon, de fundament. leg. [I. 4.]

[t] אני מאמין באמונה שלמה שהבורא יתברך שמו הוא יחיד ואין יחידות כמוהו בשום פנים והוא לבדו אלהינו היה הוה ויהיה. ספר עקרים. Vid. et Maim. in Sanh. c. 10. et Buxt. Synag. Jud. c. 1. [p. 3.]

Creator, whose name is Blessed, is one, and there is no unity like to his, and he alone was, is, and will be our God." To these testimonies we may add that of Lactantius also[u]: "Let us come to authors, and cite those very persons for the proof of this truth, which they use to bring against us. It is the poets and philosophers I mean. It is necessary, that out of these we should prove there is but one God; not as if they had the right knowledge of the truth, but because so great is the power of truth, that none can be so blind as not to see the Divine splendour forcing itself into his eyes. The poets therefore, though they set out the gods with verses, and extol their acts with the highest praises, yet they often confess, that by one spirit and mind all things are contained and governed." And truly there are many of the ancient heathen[v] poets, which have left this truth upon record in their writings, as Orpheus, Phocylides, Sophocles, Xenophanes, Colophonius, the Sibyls, and others, whose testimonies we have thrown into the margin: by which we may see that this truth is both grounded upon scripture, concluded upon by reason, preached by the Fathers, believed by the Jews, yea, and acknowledged

---

[u] Veniamus ad auctores, et eos ipsos ad veri probationem testes citemus, quibus contra nos uti solent; poetas dico et philosophos. Ex his unum Deum probemus, necesse est: non quod illi habuerint cognitam veritatem, sed quod veritatis ipsius tanta vis est, ut nemo possit esse tam cæcus, qui non viderit ingerentem se oculis divinam claritatem. Poetæ igitur, quamvis Deos carminibus ornaverint, et eorum res gestas amplificaverint summis laudibus, sæpissime tamen confitentur, spiritu et mente una contineri regique omnia. Lactant. de Falsa Relig. c. 5. [p. 14.]

[v] For this purpose is Orpheus cited not only by this author, Lactantius, but Justin Martyr also, who tells us, that though Orpheus was the first author of polytheism, yet afterwards he taught that there was but one God, in these verses:

Φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστὶ, θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι
Πάντες ὅμως· σὺ δ' ἄκουε φαεσφόρου ἔκγονε μήνης
Μουσαῖ', ἐξερέω γὰρ ἀληθέα· μηδέ σε τὰ πρὶν
Ἐν στήθεσσι φανέντα φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμέρσῃ·
Εἰς δὲ λόγον θεῖον βλέψας, τούτῳ προσέδρευε.
Ἰθύνων κραδίης νοερὸν κύτος. εὖ τ' ἐπίβαινε
Ἀτραπιτοῦ, μοῦνον δ' ἐσόρα κόσμοιο ἄνακτα.
Εἷς ἐστ' αὐτογενής· ἑνὸς ἔκγονα πάντα τέτυκται.
Ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς παραγίγνεται· οὐδὲ τὶς αὐτὸν
Εἰσοράα θνητῶν· αὐτὸς δέ γε πάντας ὁρᾶται. [p. 447.]

And again, [p. 455.]

Εἷς Ζεὺς, εἷς Ἀΐδης, εἷς Ἥλιος, εἷς Διόνυσος.
Εἷς Θεὸς ἐν πάντεσσι· Τί σοι δίχα ταῦτ' ἀγορεύω;

And Sophocles [Excerpt. e tragœd. ed. H. Grotio, p. 149.] cited by the by the Gentiles also, and therefore it may well be subscribed to by us, even that *there is but one living and true God.*

Everlasting.

After the unity of the Godhead asserted, here we have the nature of that one God described; and that by those properties, which the scriptures, that he hath revealed to us, and the reason that he hath implanted in us, attribute and ascribe unto him. Where by *properties* we are not to understand several faculties, habits, or qualities, as they are in us. For there is nothing in God but what is God: the mercy of God is the same with the God of mercy; the power of God the same with the God of power; the love of God the same with the God of love; and the truth of God the same with the God of truth. These properties of mercy, power, love, &c., as they are in us, they are accidents, and so really distinguished both from our souls, and from one another: but as they are in God, they are his nature and essence; and so neither distinguished from one another, nor from him in whom they are

---

same author, as also by Athenagoras in legat. pro Christ.

Εἷς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν, εἷς ἐστι Θεὸς,
Ὃς οὐρανὸν τέτευχε καὶ γαῖαν μακρὰν,
Πόντου τε χαροπὸν οἶδμα, καὶ ἀνέμων βίας.

Phocylides, [v. 49.]

Εἷς Θεός ἐστι σοφὸς, δυνατός γ' ἅμα καὶ πολύολβος.

Orpheus again not cited by Justin Martyr, [p. 457.]

Ζεὺς πρῶτος γένετο, Ζεὺς ὕστατος ἀρχικέραυνος,
Ζεὺς κεφαλὴ, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τέτυκται.
Ἓν κράτος, εἷς δαίμων γένετο, μέγας ἄρχος ἁπάντων.

Xenophanes Colophonius, p. 36.]

Εἷς Θεὸς ἔν τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισι μέγιστος
Οὐδὲ δέμας θνητοῖσιν ὁμοΐος οὔδε νόημα.

Horace, [l. iii. od. 4.]

Qui terram inertem, qui mare temperat
Ventosum, et urbes, regnaque tristia
Divosque, mortalesque turmas
Imperio regit unus æquo.

The Sibyls, [p. 3. B.]

Εἷς θεὸς, ὃς μόνος ἄρχει, ὑπερμεγέθης, ἀγένητος,
Παντοκράτωρ, ἀόρατος, ὁρῶν μόνος αὐτὸς ἅπαντα·
Αὐτὸς δ' οὐ βλέπεται θνητῆς ὑπὸ σαρκὸς ἁπάσης.

And again, [p. 19. C.]

Εἷς θεός ἐστι μόναρχος, ἀθέσφατος, αἰθέρι ναίων,
Αὐτοφυὴς, ἀόρατος, ὁρῶν μόνος αὐτὸς ἅπαντα.

And truly these ancient poets, as Orpheus, Sophocles, &c., and particularly the Sibyls, the Fathers in the infancy of the church made great use of to convince the Gentiles from their own authors, that there was but one God whom they ought to worship. And so indeed did St. Paul himself, disputing with the Greeks, cite their own poet Aratus against them, in those words,

Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν. Acts xvii. 28.

said to be. Distinguished from him or his essence they cannot be, for then he would be of himself imperfect; there being some property or perfection which in his own nature he is not. And again, if the properties of God should be really distinguished from himself, in themselves they would be either finite or infinite. Finite they could not all be; for infinitude itself is one of his properties, yea, and in our conception a property of all his other properties: so that his wisdom, power, justice, are all infinite, otherwise they would be imperfect: and therefore it is impossible all his properties, or indeed any of them, should be finite. And as they are not finite, so neither can they be infinite, if really distinguished from his essence: for then there would be something really distinguished from God infinite as well as God; and by consequence either God must not be infinite, and so not God; or else there must be two, yea, many infinites, which is as great an absurdity as the former. And therefore we must needs acknowledge, that the properties of God are not really distinguished from the essence of God: but that the properties attributed to his essence are really the same with his essence to which they are attributed. So that his power, wisdom, goodness, truth, and the like, are all his [u] essence, nature, or substance. And as they are not distinguished from his essence, so neither are they distinguished from one another; for then they must be really distinguished from his essence too, it being impossible that they should be all really and essentially distinct from one another, and yet be all but one and the selfsame essence. And again, if they should be really distinguished from one another, then God would be compounded or made up of several distinct properties, and so not a simple, and therefore not a perfect God.

---

[u] There are many expressions in St. Augustine intimating and explaining this unto us, that the properties of God are the same with his essence. Homo aliud est, saith he, quod est, aliud quod potest, &c. Deus autem cui non est alia substantia ut sit, et alia potestas ut possit, sed consubstantiale illi est quicquid ejus est, et quicquid est quia Deus est, non alio modo est, et alio modo potest, sed esse et posse simul habet, quia velle et facere simul habet. Aug. [vol. III. par. II.] in Joh. Tract. 20. [4.] Non alia visio ejus, et alia substantia ejus; nec alia potentia ejus, alia substantia ejus; totum quod est, (filius) de patre est, totum quod potest, de patre est: quoniam quod potest et est hoc unum est. [Ibid. 8.] Si enim, quod pauci intelligunt, simplex est natura veritatis; hoc est filio (Deo) esse quod nosse. Ab illo ergo habet ut noverit, a quo habet ut sit: non ut prius ab illo esset, et ab illo postea nosset; sed quemadmodum illi gignendo dedit ut esset, sic gignendo dedit ut nosset: quia simplici, ut dictum est, naturæ veritatis esse et

But by the properties therefore of God, we are to understand the several apprehensions that we have of him, according to the several manifestations that he maketh of himself to us. Which variety of discoveries of himself he maketh to us according to the variety of the objects which we apprehend him to act upon, and the variety of the circumstances that those objects may lie under. God in himself is a most simple and pure act, and therefore, as I have shewed, cannot have any thing in himself but himself, but what is that pure and simple act itself. Which seeing it bringeth upon every creature what it deserves, giving vice its due punishments, and virtue its just rewards, we apprehend it an act of justice, and therefore call God a just God. Seeing it doth not give sin its punishments sometime so soon as we conceive it might, we apprehend it an act of patience, and call God a patient God. Seeing it doth still one time or other punish every offence, and yet upon some other account doth often pardon the offender, we apprehend it an act of mercy, and call God a merciful God. Seeing whensoever it puts forth itself upon doing any thing, it produceth whatsoever itself pleaseth, we apprehend it an act of might, and call God an almighty God. Seeing it acting upon objects, as possible to be known, it is acquainted with all things, that ever were, are, shall be, or can be, we apprehend it an act of knowledge, and call God an all-knowing God. Seeing it brings upon all creatures many such

---

nosse, non est aliud atque aliud, sed hoc ipsum. Ibid. Tract. 40. [5.] Nefas autem est dicere ut subsistat et subsit Deus bonitati suæ, atque illa bonitas non substantia sit vel potius essentia; neque ipse Deus sit bonitas sua, sed sit in illo tanquam in subjecto. Id. de Trinit. l. 7. c. 5. [vol. VIII. l. vii. 10.] And the council at Rhemes, an. 1148, in their confession of faith expressly say, Credimus et confitemur simplicem naturam divinitatis esse Deum nec aliquo sensu catholico posse negari, quin divinitas sit Deus, et Deus divinitas. Sicubi vero dicitur, domini sapientia sapientem, magnitudine magnum, divinitate deum esse, et alià hujusmodi, credimus non nisi ea sapientia quæ est ipse Deus sapientem esse, non nisi ea magnitudine quæ est ipse deus magnum esse, non nisi ea æternitate quæ est ipse deus æternum esse, non nisi ea unitate unum quæ est ipse, non nisi ea divinitate Deum quæ est ipse, id est seipso sapientem, magnum, æternum, unum Deum. Concil. Rhem. fid. symb. [vol. VI. par. II. p. 1299.]

as we think good things, we apprehend it an act of goodness, and call God a good God. Seeing there are no bounds or limits of his essence and glory, we apprehend it an act of infinitude, and call God an infinite God. And seeing this God ever was, is, and will be the same unchangeable, pure and simple act, we apprehend it an act of eternity, and so call God an eternal God. And thus are the several properties that we attribute to God but the several apprehensions that we have in ourselves of him, according to the several discoveries that he maketh of himself to us: and therefore though, as they are conceived by us, they are many, yet, as they are in him, they are all but one and the same simple and pure essence. And hence it is, that though his properties cannot be properly predicated one of another, so as to say his justice is his mercy, his wisdom is his power, his eternity is his love, yet they may all be predicated of God, so as to say God is justice, God is mercy, God is wisdom, power, and eternity. Neither can they only be predicated of God, but God may be predicated of them too, so as to say, justice in God is God, mercy is God, power is God; for as they are in himself they are really himself, yea, so as that if we consider the properties of God as they are in himself, I do not deny but they may in some sense, though improperly, be [x] predicated one of another, so as to say his justice is his mercy, his love is his power; for as they are in him there is no such distinction betwixt justice and mercy, love and power, as there is when apprehended by us. But seeing the properties of God do not so much denote what God is, as what we apprehend him to be in himself, when the properties of God are predicated one of another, one thing in God is not predicated of another, but our apprehensions of the same thing are predicated one of another. So that when I say, God's justice is his mercy, his power is his wisdom, I do not predicate one perfection in God of another, for in God there are not any such distinct perfections as that one of them should properly make the subject and the other the predicate of a proposition, but I only predicate one apprehension that I have of the same Divine nature of the other. For as they are in God, they are not really distinct, I say, from one another; and therefore cannot properly be subjects and predicates to one another; and the several denominations of love, goodness, justice, mercy, and the like, are grounded merely upon our several apprehensions of the same thing: which several apprehensions proceed from the finiteness of our understandings, who are not able to conceive of infinitude, or an infinite nature, as it is in itself, but only by piecemeal, as it manifesteth itself to us. And therefore God, whose understanding is infinite, suitable to his nature, doth not apprehend himself under the distinct notions of good, just, powerful, wise, &c., but only as God; though he doth understand how we give such denominations to him, according to the several apprehensions that we have of him.

---

[x] Thus St. Augustine saith: An totus ille visus et totus auditus? forte ita, imo non forte sed vere ita: dum tamen et ipsum ejus videre et ipsum ejus audire longe alio modo quam nostrum sit; et videre et audire simul in verbo est: nec aliud ibi est audire et aliud videre, sed auditus visus, et visus auditus. Aug. [vol. III. par. II.] in Joh. Tract. 18. [9.] Where we see he predicates visus of auditus, and auditus of visus; and so one property in God of another. Not as if these properties were distinct in God, and so capable of making the subject and predicate of a proposition; but in such propositions as these are, visus est auditus, and auditus visus, justitia est misericordia, and misericordia est justitia, in these, I say, and such like propositions we are to understand both the subject and predicate as in God, but still with some

Thus, therefore, carrying the right notion of the properties of God along with us, let us consider those properties which in this article are attributed to him; and the first is eternity. He is an *everlasting* God: which is a property, whereby we apprehend God, as one, who was before, and will be after, always without and above time; in whom there is no such thing as first and last, past and to come. And therefore though I cannot apprehend his mercy to Abel in the beginning of the world, and his mercy to me now, but as two

---

reference to our distinct apprehensions of them. For seeing they are really the same in him, and yet are distinctly apprehended by us, we may well make one of them the subject and the other the predicate of a proposition. When I say justitia est misericordia, here justitia and misericordia are two distinct properties in my apprehension, though they signify one and the same thing in God, or rather one and the same God. And therefore when I say, God's justice is his mercy, or his mercy is his justice, it is as much as if I should say, that perfection which I apprehend in God to be justice is the same in him with his mercy, and that which I apprehend in him as mercy is the same in him with his justice.

distinct expressions of his mercy, yet as they are in God they are but one and the same act, as they are in God, I say, who is not measured by time, as our apprehensions of him are; but is himself eternity: a centre without a circumference, eternity without time. Indeed when we speak of eternity, time is but as a parenthesis clasped in of both sides with it: neither is the eternity before time before that eternity that is after time; for there is but one eternity. and these words, *before* and *after*, [y] *past* and *to come*, are solecisms in eternity, being only fitted to express the several successions of time by. And thus do we believe that God is eternal or everlasting, not only as angels and rational souls are, who had a beginning but will have no end, but as one who never had a beginning, nor ever will have an end: but what he was before, he is in, and will be after time, the same unchangeable God; not younger at the beginning of time, nor older at the end of time, but in every thing continually one and the same God blessed for evermore.

And for the true proof of this we shall first consult the scriptures: for there being none that knows God so well as himself, there is none can better tell what properties to attribute to him than himself; and therefore his word must needs be the best description of his essence. Now there is no property that the scriptures attribute to God more frequently than eternity, calling him, *The eternal God*, Deut. xxxiii. 27;

---

[y] Nec quid sit æternitas, nisi intelligendo conspicio. Mentis enim aspectu omnem mutabilitatem ab æternitate sejungo: et in ipsa æternitate nulla spatia temporis cerno; quia spatia temporis præteritis et futuris rerum motibus constant. Nihil autem præterit in æterno, et nihil futurum est: quia et quod præterit, desinit, et quod futurum est, nondum esse cœpit. Æternitas autem tantummodo est, nec fuit quasi jam non sit, nec erit quasi adhuc non sit. Qua propter sola ipsa verissime dicere potuit, *Ego sum qui sum*, et de illa verissime dici poterat, *qui est misit me*. Aug. de vera rel. c. 49. fin. [vol. I. 97.] Et hoc vere habendum est æternum, quod nullo tempore variatur, sicut in principio erat Verbum. Id. [vol. IV.] in Psal. lxxi. [8.] Atque in æternitate nec præteritum quicquam est, quasi esse desierit; nec futurum, quasi nondum sit; sed præsens tantum; quia quicquid æternum est, semper est. Id. in Ps. ii. [6.] Æternitas ipsa Dei substantia est, quæ nihil habet mutabile; ibi nihil est præteritum, quasi jam non sit; nihil est futurum, quasi nondum sit: sed non est ibi nisi, Est; non est ibi, Fuit et erit; quia et quod fuit, jam non est; et quod erit, nondum est: sed quicquid ibi est, nonnisi est. Id. in Ps. ci. Serm. 2. [10.]

The King eternal, 1 Tim. i. 17; *The everlasting God*, Gen. xxi. 33, Isai. xl. 28; *The everlasting Father*, Isai. ix. 6; *The living God, and an everlasting King*, Jer. x. 10; *Yea, from everlasting to everlasting he is God*, Psalm xc. 2; Who therefore is to be *blessed from everlasting and to everlasting*, Psalm xli. 13; *Who is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, which is, which was, and which is to come*, Rev. i. 4, 8. Not as if God in his own nature was, and is to come, for he always is; but in these and the like places God speaks after the manner of men, who are not able with one simple apprehension to conceive of eternity, but are still forced to carry our thoughts backwards and forwards to apprehend what was heretofore and shall be hereafter: therefore he is here said to be He that was, viz., *without beginning*, that is, viz., *without succession*, and is to come, viz., *without end*. And therefore, when Moses would have God to give himself a name, he calls himself [z] *I am what I am*, and simply *I am*, Exod. iii. 14, viz.

---

[z] Interpreters differ much in translating of these words אהיה אשר. אהיה Some translating them, *Ero, qui sum;* others, *Ero, qui ero;* others, *Sum, qui eram;* others, *Sum, qui sum:* and there is none of these interpretations but without offering violence to grammar rules may be put upon them. But it being a proper name of God, implying not any one, but all of these senses; others thought it better to retain the Hebrew words themselves, especially the Oriental translators, as Onkelos אהיה אשר אהיה the Syriac ܐܗܝܐ ܐܫܪ ܐܗܝܐ Samar. ࠀࠄࠉࠄ ࠀࠔࠓ ࠀࠄࠉࠄ the Persian اهيه اشر اهيه Ehjeh asher Ehjeh. Only the Arabic doth not so much translate as expound the words, most excellently giving us the full meaning and purport of them, taking in all the foregoing expositions in these words, الازلي الذي لا يزول Æternus sum qui non præterit. Which words shew both what the words properly denote, even the eternity of God; and wherein the nature of that eternity consisteth, even in being always the same, without preterition or succession of one part after another. And truly that these words do import the eternity of God, and by consequence not in vain made use of under this head, we have also abundant testimony from the Fathers. Quia divinum omne neque abolitioni, neque exordio obnoxium est. Et cum in nullo a se Dei desit æternitas, digne hoc solum quod esset ad protestationem incorruptæ suæ æternitatis ostendit. Et ad hanc quidem infinitatis significationem, satis fecisse sermo dicentis videbatur, Ego sum, qui sum. Hilar. de Trinit. l. 1. [5, 6.] *Βούλει καὶ τὸ ἀΐδιον μαθεῖν; ἄκουσον τί φησιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς περὶ τοῦ πατρός· ἐρωτήσας γὰρ εἰ ἐρωτηθείη παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, τίς ὁ ἀπεσταλκὼς αὐτὸν εἴη, τί κελεύεται ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτοῖς, ἤκουσεν, εἰπὲ, ὅτι ὁ ὢν ἀπεσταλκέ με. τὸ δὲ, ὁ ὢν, τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι σημαντικόν ἐστι καὶ τοῦ ἀνάρχως εἶναι, καὶ τοῦ ὄντως εἶναι καὶ κυριώς.* Chrysost. in Joh. Hom. 15. tom. ii. p. 614. *Ὁς οἰκείαν ἑαυτῷ καὶ πρέπουσαν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀϊδιότητι ἐν τῷ πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον θεράποντα Μωσέα*

one who may always say *I am*, who always was, always is, and always is to come; who from eternity was, who in eternity is, who to eternity is to come. Yea, who is not only from eternity and to eternity, but who is eternity itself: and so is he called too as some suppose, (translating the word [a] *netsahh eternity*, which we translate *strength*,) 1 Sam. xv. 29. So well may he be called *the Ancient of Days*, Dan. vii. 9. and his kingdom be termed *an everlasting kingdom*, Dan. iv. 3.

And as scripture is express, so is reason clear in attributing this property unto God. For first, eternity is a perfection, such a perfection without which the great God sometime would not have been, or sometimes will not be, and therefore can never be absolutely perfect, and so not God. And therefore all the arguments that prove the existence, prove also, not only the unity, but likewise the eternity of God. For what argument is an infallible proof of any truth, ever was and ever will be an infallible proof of it. But now if God ever was not, or ever would not be, (that is, if he be not eternal,) at such a time there would be no God; and therefore all the arguments that make for the existence of a Deity would then signify nothing: and so it is as certain a truth that God is eternal, as that he is.

χρηματισμῷ προσηγορίαν ἐξεῦρεν, ὄντα ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάσας, Ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμί φησιν ὁ ὤν. Basil. advers. Eunom. l. 2. [vol. I. p. 741 E.] St. Augustine, in his tenth tome, hath a peculiar treatise, De eo quod dictum est Ego sum qui sum, where amongst other things he saith, Quid est Ego sum qui sum nisi æternus sum? Quid est Ego sum qui sum nisi mutari non possum? Nulla creatura, non cœlum, non terra, non angelus, non virtus, non sedes, non dominationes, non potestates. Cum ergo sit hoc nomen æternitatis, plus est quod dignatus est habere nomen misericordiæ, Ego sum Deus Abraham, &c. Aug. de eo quod dictum est Ego sum qui sum. [vol. V. ser. vii. 7.] Yea, and Plato himself gathered as much from these words, as we may see out of Justin Martyr, cited amongst the Fathers at the end of this discourse concerning God's eternity. V. Allat. de cons. 123.

[a] And so I find the word נֶצַח can never be well translated otherwise than *eternity*, unless it be, Isai. lxiii. 3, 6. Thren. iii. 18; but in these places also interpreters much differ in the translation of it, but always agree in other places in expounding it *eternity*, as Psal. xlix. 20. Isai. xxxiv. 10. Job iv. 20, &c. and so in this place, 1 Sam. xv. 29, it being an epithet of God it may denote his eternity, as well as strength: yea indeed rather that than this; both because it is a doubt, whether it ever signify *strength* or no, and principally because that the other is the most usual and common signification of it, which we are not to recede from in any place, that will as well bear it, as well as any other signification of it, as it will here.

Again, if God be not eternal he is temporal, that is, his essence and actions are measured by the motions and successions of time, which being once granted, would quite take away his divinity: for then he would not be the first cause, and so not God; having time before him, whereby he is measured, the thing measured always presupposing that which it is measured by.

And these arguments serve to prove his eternity in general, that he both was from eternity and will be to eternity. I shall now prove them severally: and first, that he was from eternity, that is, he ever was, or it could never be said, God is not, or there is no God. For if ever God was not, then he had a beginning; if he had a beginning, he must needs have it either from himself or from some other person. From himself he could not have it, for before he was, he could not act any thing, much less give himself a being or beginning; nay, it is a contradiction to say, a thing is not, and yet it is, which notwithstanding must be a real truth, if God ever was not, and yet was the author of life to himself. And that he did not receive his being from another is as clear, for then he would not be the first cause, and so not God; there being another before him, which gave this being to him, and so was the cause of him. And that he shall be to eternity is also as evident as that he hath been from eternity; that he ever shall be, as that he ever was. For as if he was not from eternity he must have his beginning, so, if he be not to eternity he must have his end, either from himself or from some other. From any other he cannot; for all other persons and beings depend upon him, both for their existences and actions; and so can do nothing without his pleasure and concurrence: much less can they ever destroy his essence who preserves theirs. From himself he cannot have an end, lose his existence, or fall to nothing. For if so, it must be either because he is not able or not willing to uphold himself in his being: that he is not unable is manifest, for there is no more power required to uphold himself to eternity than there was to uphold himself from eternity, which that he did we have before proved. And that he is not unwilling to uphold himself in his being to eternity is plain. For his will being infinitely perfect, he cannot but will the better before the worse. Now for him to be must needs be better than for him not to be; for his essence and existence is the chiefest good, and therefore he must needs will, love, and choose that before all things in the world besides, much more before nothing, as himself would be, if he be not, or did not uphold himself in his being. And therefore as he was as able as willing to support himself from eternity, so must he needs be granted to be as willing as able to support himself in his being to eternity; and therefore reason also concludes him to be an *everlasting* God.

But neither are the Fathers backward in ascribing this perfection to the Deity. Tertullian elegantly[b]: "There is no time in eternity, itself being all time. That which acts cannot suffer. That wanteth age, that cannot be born. God, if he be old, he will not be; if he be young, he was not. Novelty testifies a beginning, age threatens an end. But God is as far from beginning and end as he is from time, the measurer of beginning and ending." And again: "[c]For it belongeth to the Divine nature, whatsoever it hath decreed, to account as perfect: because with it there is no difference of time, with which eternity itself directs the uniform state of time." And Justin Martyr tells us, "that Plato gathered as much from those words, *I am what I am*: [d]for Plato," saith he, "being much pleased with that saying of God to Moses, *I am what I am*; and receiving or understanding with much contemplation the short word expressed by a participle, perceived how God, willing to signify his eternity to Moses, said, *I am what I am;* the syllable *am* signifying not one, but three times, past, present, and to come." (From whence we may also observe that Plato had seen the books of Moses.) And Minutius Felix saith[e]: "Dost thou believe that the supreme power in heaven is divided? and all the power of that true and divine empire to be parted? When it is manifest, that the Father of all things, God, hath neither beginning nor end; who bestows a nativity upon all things else, but a perpetuity upon himself: who was before the world, being a world unto himself." And St. Augustine[f]: "God only is immutable; because nothing that is past goes from him, neither will any thing that is to come be added to him: but whatsoever is, was, or is to come, is all present with him. And as we can think of nothing (in him) that had a beginning, so neither can we think of any thing in him that shall ever have an end." And elsewhere, the same reverend Father in his heavenly meditations and confessions speaks thus to God: "[g] But if there was no time before heaven and earth, why should any one ask, what thou then didst? For there was no *then* where there was no time: neither wast thou before time in time; for so thou wouldst not have been before all time. But thou art before all time past, in the height of eternity always present; and art above all things that are to come, because they are to come, and when they are come will be gone. *But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end;* thy years do not go and come, but ours go and come, that they may all come. Thy years stand all together, because they always stand. Neither are they that go thrust out by them that come, because they do not pass away: but ours will all be when they will not all be. Thy years are but one day, and thy day is not every day, but to-day. For thy *to-day* doth not give place to *to-morrow:* for neither did it come into the place of yesterday. Thy *to-day* is eternity; therefore didst thou beget one co-eternal with thyself to whom thou saidst, *This day have I begotten thee.*" Many other testimonies might be produced both from the Fathers and [h] others, but these are enough from whence to conclude as before from scripture and reason, that as *there is but one living and true God*, so this one living and true God is *everlasting.*

---

[b] Non habet tempus æternitas. Omne enim tempus ipsa est. Quod facit, pati non potest. Caret ætate, quod non licet nasci. Deus, si est vetus, non erit: si est novus, non fuit. Novitas initium testificatur: vetustas finem comminatur. Deus autem tam alienus ab initio et fine est, quam a tempore, arbitro et metatore initii et finis. Tertull. adv. Marcion. lib. 1. [c. 8.]

[c] Nam et divinitati competit, quæcunque decreverit, ut perfecta reputare, quia non sit apud illam differentia temporis, apud quam uniformem statum temporis dirigit æternitas ipsa. Ibid. lib. 3. [c. 5.]

[d] Ἀρεσθεὶς γὰρ [ὁ Πλάτων] τῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸν Μωϋσέα εἰρημένῳ, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὦν, καὶ τὴν βραχεῖαν διὰ τῆς μετοχῆς εἰρημένην ῥῆσιν, μετὰ πολλῆς θεωρίας δεξάμενος, ἔγνω ὅτι τὴν ἀϊδιότητα αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Μωϋσῇ σημῆναι θέλων, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὦν ἔφη, τῆς ὢν συλλαβῆς, οὐχ ἕνα μόνον δηλούσης, ἀλλὰ τοὺς τρεῖς τόν τε παρεληλυθότα καὶ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα. Justin. ad Græc. cohort. 1. [25.]

---

[e] Tu in cœlo summam potestatem dividi credas? et scindi veri illius ac divini imperii totam potestatem? cum palam sit parentem omnium nec principium habere nec terminum; qui nativitatem omnibus præstat, sibi perpetuitatem, qui ante mundum fuerit sibi ipse pro mundo. Minut. Fel. in Octav. [xviii. 7.]

[f] Deus solus est immutabilis, quia nihil præteriti ei decedit, nihil futuri accedit: sed quicquid est vel fuit vel erit, totum sibi præsens adest: et sicut non potest cogitari quod aliquod initium habuerit, ita quoque non potest cogitari quod unquam finiri possit. August. [vol. VI.] de cognit. veræ vitæ, [Append.] c. 31.

[g] Si autem ante cœlum et terram nullum erat tempus, cur quæritur quid tunc faciebas? Non enim erat tunc, ubi non erat tempus. Nec tu tempore tempora præcedis, alioquin non omnia tempora præcederes. Sed præcedis omnia tempora præterita celsitudine semper præsentis æternitatis; et superas omnia futura, quia et illa futura sunt, et cum venerint, præterita erunt, Tu autem idem ipse es, et anni tui non deficient. Anni tui nec eunt nec veniunt: isti enim nostri et eunt et veniunt, ut omnes veniant. Anni tui omnes simul stant, quoniam stant; nec euntes à venientibus excluduntur, quia non transeunt: Isti autem nostri omnes erunt, cum omnes non erunt. Anni tui dies unus; et dies tuus non quotidie sed hodie; quia hodiernus tuus non cedit crastino, neque enim succedit hesterno: Hodiernus tuus æternitas; ideo coæternum genuisti, cui dixisti, *Ego hodie genui te.* Aug. [vol. I.] Confess. l. xi. c. 13. [l. xi. 15, 16.]

Without body, parts, and passions.

When we poor finite creatures set ourselves to consider of our infinite Creator, though we may apprehend something of him by ascribing all perfections to him, yet more by removing all imperfections from him. We cannot so well apprehend what he is, as what he is not. We can say indeed he is infinitely good, infinitely wise, in and of himself, eternal and all-sufficient: but alas! when we speak such words, we cannot apprehend the thing that is signified by them. Our understandings being themselves finite, they cannot apprehend what it is to be infinite, and as they are imperfect, they cannot conceive of any perfection as it is in God. But now of imperfections we have the daily experience in ourselves, and therefore know the better how to abstract them all from our apprehensions of the Deity: and so the clearest apprehensions that we can have of him is by removing imperfections from him. I cannot conceive it, though I verily believe it, how he is of himself infinitely holy, just, and powerful; yet I can easily conceive how he is without body, parts, and passions; that he is not such a one as I am, who have a body, am compounded of parts, and am subject to passions: but whatsoever he is in himself, be sure he is infinitely above such imperfections as these are.

---

[h] As the Sibyls, Orac. l. 2. [p. 19. C.]

'Αλλ' αὐτὸς ἀνέδειξεν αἰῶνος αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν,
"Οντα τε καὶ πρὶν ἔοντα, ἀτὰρ πάλι καὶ μετέπειτα.

Yea, it is one of the articles of the Jews' faith, אני מאמין באמונה שלמה ש״ש הוא ראשון והוא אחרון I believe perfectly, or with a perfect faith, that he is the first and the last. V. Maim. in Sanh. c. 10.

First, therefore, here it is said, he is [i] *without body*, that is, he is not made up of any material substance, but is a spirit, incorruptible, intangible, invisible, and indivisible; that cannot be seen, felt, nor heard by bodily senses, nor corrupted or divided by any means whatsoever. Of whom therefore we are not to frame any picture or idea in our minds, but are still to apprehend him only as a God incomprehensible: and if whilst we are meditating of him any bodily shape presents itself to our thoughts, we are to remove it from him we are thinking of, and conceive of him as without body: and,

Secondly, *without parts* too; that is, without all mixture or composition whatsoever; whether of matter and form, as a man is compounded of soul and body; or of subject and accident, as a wise man, of wisdom and a man; or of act and power, as any thing that is, but may not be, or is not, but may be; or of *genus* and *differentia*, as when a specifical difference restrains a general nature to a certain species contained under it; or lastly, of *esse* and *essentia*, as when a thing is said to be by its essence. When God is said to be without parts, all these compositions are removed from him, or denied to be in him, yea, the last and subtlest of them all: so that God cannot be said to be by his essence, for then his essence would be one thing, and his being another: and therefore he cannot be said to be by his essence, but to be essence itself. And therefore when we think of God, we are not to apprehend him as made up of several parts, but as one most pure, simple, Divine essence, without all manner of parts whatsoever, yea, and

---

[i] Καὶ τὸ θεῖόν φαμεν εἶναι ἀσώματον, οὐχ ὅτι ἔστιν ἀσώματον· (ἐπέκεινα γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς τῇ αὐτοῦ οὐσίᾳ, ὥσπερ τοῦ σώματος, οὕτως καὶ τοῦ ἀσωμάτου, ὡς ἑκατέρου τούτων ὑπάρχων δημιουργός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἃ αὐτὸς ὑπάρχει) ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἰώθαμεν ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν τιμιωτέροις ὑλικοῖς ἀεὶ γεραίρειν τὸ θεῖον, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν· οὐχ ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ τούτων δεομένου, ἀλλ' ἡμῶν τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἔννοιαν αὐτοῖς ἐνδεικνυμένων. Τούτῳ οὖν τῷ τρόπῳ ὀνομάζομεν αὐτὸν ἀσώματον, καίτοι εἰδότες αὐτὸν ἐπέκεινα ὑπάρχοντα τοῦ ἀσωμάτου, ὡς τούτου δημιουργόν. Justin. in Quæst. Græc. confut. quæst. 2. [p. 538. D.] Ὡσαύτως δὲ ἐπειδὴ τὸ μὴ κρατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τινὸς τοῦ κρατεῖσθαι τιμιώτερόν ἐστιν, διὰ τοῦτο καλοῦμεν αὐτὸν ἀσώματον. Ibid. [p. 539. B.]

Thirdly, *without passions* too; that is, not subject to nor capable of love, hatred, joy, grief, anger, and the like, as they daily arise in us imperfect creatures; but he is always the same unmovable, unchangeable, impassible God: and therefore in all our contemplations of the Divine essence, we are not to conceive him as one passionately rejoicing or grieving for any thing, as we do, but as a pure and perfect essence, without body, parts, and passions too; as appears from scripture, reason, and fathers.

First, from scripture, which clearly asserts the great God to be without body, saying, *God is a* [j] *spirit*, John iv. 24; and *a spirit hath not flesh and bones*, as a body hath, as our Saviour (who better knew the nature of a spirit than all our sceptical philosophers, that attribute matter to it, ever did, or can do) expressly tells us, Luke xxiv. 39. And to this purpose also it is said, *To whom then will you liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?* Isai. xl. 18. Whereas if God had a body, we might easily answer the prophet; he is of such or such a likeness or shape, for every body must have some shape or other. And therefore also doth Moses counsel the Israelites, that they do not make any graven image, any picture, or similitude of God[k], Deut.

---

[j] Οὐ τοίνυν δύνατον πνεῦμα ἀκούσαντα περιγεγραμμένην φύσιν ἐντυπῶσαι τῇ διανοίᾳ ἢ τροπαῖς, καὶ ἀλλοιώσεσιν ὑποκειμένην, ἢ ὅλως ὁμοίαν τῇ κτίσει, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀνωτάτω ταῖς ἐννοίαις χωροῦντα, νοερὰν οὐσίαν ἐπάναγκες ἐννοεῖν, ἄπειρον κατὰ δύναμιν, μεγέθει ἀπεριόριστον, χρόνοις ἢ αἰῶσιν ἀμέτρητον, ἄφθονον ὧν ἔχει καλῶν. Basil. de Spirit. Sanct. c. 9. [vol. II. p. 311. C.]

[k] Upon this place it is that the Jews build the third article of their faith, אני מאמין באמונה שלמה אינו גוף ולא ישיגוהו משיגי הגוף ואין לו שום דמיון כלל i. e. I verily believe that he (God) is not a body, neither can he be comprehended with any bodily comprehensions, neither is there any thing like unto Him. V. R. Joseph Albo in ספר עקרים et Maim. in Sanh. cap. 10.

iv. 12, 15—18: which was the great sin the Romans were guilty of, and St. Paul reproves them for, Rom. i. 23.

And the same scriptures that tell us he is without body, assure us also that he is without parts, if we understand quantitative or extensive parts. And that he is without all manner of parts and compositions whatsoever, the name Jehovah, which he gives unto himself, Gen. xv. 7, Amos ix. 6, and which he will not suffer to be given to any other being, plainly imports, signifying essence in the most pure, simple, and abstracted notion that possibly can be conceived, from an Hebrew root that signifies *to be:* and therefore the word denotes such an essence as is of itself pure and simple essence, which God could not be, had he any parts whatsoever, for then he would have his essence from them, and so would not so much as be of himself, much less essence itself.

And therefore also we must conclude him to be without passions too, as well as parts; for if he be such a pure essence, yea, essence itself, it is impossible he should be subject to any passions. But this, that he is without passions, appears more clearly from these words, *God is not a man, that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent,* Num. xxiii. 19. But most clearly of all in that Paul and Barnabas, to convince the people at Lystra that they were not Gods, but men, tell them, they were *men of like passions*, or [1] *subject to passions, as well as they*, Acts xiv. 14. And St. James useth the same argument to prove that Elias was a man too, James v. 17. Now had God been subject to passions as well as men, the apostles would have been much overseen in their logics, using an argument that would make as much against them as for them.

---

[1] So the Syriac translates the Greek words, *καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ἔσμεν ὑμῖν ἄνθρωποι* by ܐܦ ܚܢܢ ܒܢܝܢܫܐ ܚܢܢ ܚܫܘܫܐ ܐܝܟܘܬܟܘܢ Et nos homines sumus passionibus obnoxii sicut et vos; implying, that if they were gods, to whom such worship ought to be performed, they would not have been subject to such passions as men are. And so where it is said, *Ἡλίας ἄνθρωπος ἦν ὁμοιοπαθὴς ἡμῖν*, the same translation renders it ܐܦ ܐܠܝܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܚܫܘܫܐ ܐܝܟܘܬܢ Et Elias erat homo passionibus obnoxius sicut et nos. Jac. v. 17. As if he should have said, Elias was a man as well as we, as we may see in that he was subject to passions as well as we, which if he had been God he would not have been; and yet he prayed and prevailed with God, and why may not we?

I know the Anthropomorphitæ, that fancied God to have a body, parts, and passions like to us, pretend much to scripture to ground this their heresy upon; because in scripture God is often said to have eyes, ears, feet, a mouth, bowels, backparts; as also to love, hate, mourn, rejoice, be angry, and the like. And it is true, such things as these are frequently attributed to God in holy scripture, but improperly, by a figure the schoolmen call *Anthropopatheia*. And the reason is because should God speak always of himself as he is in himself, we should not be able to understand him; and therefore he fits his expressions to our apprehensions; he speaks of things, not so much as they are in themselves, but as we are able to conceive of them. Therefore when he would make known himself to us, he speaks as a nurse to a child, who utters not her mind in complete sentences, but lisps it out in broken language, fitted to the shallow capacity of its tender years. Thus, I say, doth the great God speak in broken and imperfect language to us, making use of the names that we give to the several [m] parts of our bodies and passions of our minds, to signify to us the Divine properties which are in himself, or the effects of them to us. Thus he useth the word *eye*, to signify his omniscience, because the eye is that part of the body whereby we see any thing; the word *hand*, to express his power, because it is that whereby we do any thing; and thus doth he use also the words *rejoicing*, *grieving*, *loving*, *hating*, *repenting*, and the like, to denote something in him which we cannot apprehend but by the dark resemblance that these passions and affections that are in us have to it. His love denotes his eternal purpose and decree to reward virtue; his hatred and anger, his eternal purpose to punish vice; and so repentance doth not signify any change in his essence or decree, but only in his [n]actions mutably decreed from eternity, that is, decreed to be changed upon such and such occasions and conditions. And therefore, though these things be spoken after the manner of men, we are to understand them as becomes the [o]majesty of God.

---

[m] Sed hæc rursum non secundum errorem Judæorum, vel etiam ex nostris nonnullorum, qui cum illis errant: eatenus dicimus, ut quoniam humana fragilitas aliter audire de Deo non potest, nisi ut sibi res ipsa et vocabula nota sunt, idcirco etiam membris hæc nostris similibus et habitu humano Deum agere sentiamus. Alienum hoc est ab ecclesiastica fide. Sed hoc ipsum, quod vel aspirat in corde uniuscujusque sanctorum, vel sonum vocis pervenire ad aures ejus facit, locutus homini Deus dicitur. Sic et cum nota esse sibi indicat quæ unusquisque vel loquitur, vel agit, audisse se dicit; et cum aliquid injustum geri à nobis indicat, irasci se dicit: cum beneficiis suis ingratos nos arguit, pœnitere se dicit: indicans quidem hæc his affectibus, qui hominibus in usu sunt. Origen. in Gen. Hom. 3. [p. 9. A.]

And what scripture herein asserts, reason also consenteth to. For, first, that God is without body must needs be granted, for otherwise he would be finite, and so not God: for every body hath dimensions every one of which is finite, and therefore can never make up an infinite body: or suppose we should fancy God to have a body infinite like himself, this body must be either the same with himself, and so he must be nothing but a body, (it being impossible that a body and spirit should both make up but one uncompounded substance,) and so not the first, nor indeed any cause at all, a mere body or matter being of itself incapable of action; or else it must be really distinct from him, and if so, then either he must not be infinite, and so not God, or else there must be two infinites; which I have before convinced of absurdity. But that God hath no body appeareth also in that he hath no parts, parts necessarily accompanying every body.

And that God hath no parts, or is not [p]compounded, is clear in that we cannot look upon God but as a Being in and of himself most absolutely perfect, yea, as perfection and essence itself; incapable of receiving perfection from any thing, himself being the fountain, yea, perfection of all perfections; and therefore in Hebrew he hath called himself *Schaddai*, Gen. xvii. 1, that is, one of himself perfect and all-sufficient: whereas if he have any parts, it is from those parts, not from himself, that he receives perfection: whatsoever is compounded receiving its perfection from the parts it is compounded of, some perfection from one part, some from another, and all from all; and therefore wheresoever any part is lacking, the whole cannot be perfect. So that to say God hath parts, is as much as to say, he is not of himself perfect, and so not God: and so also if God be compounded of any thing, the parts he is compounded of being necessarily before himself that is compounded of them, he cannot be the first of beings, much less the first of causes; the parts being always in nature at least before the whole. And again, if he have parts, they are either finite or infinite; infinite they cannot be, for then there would be more infinites than one: and therefore if he have parts, these parts can be but finite; and if so, himself that is compounded of them cannot be infinite: for many finites can never make one infinite Being, neither can any parts ever make the whole of an higher nature than themselves are, or howsoever, [p] so much higher as infinite is above finite: and therefore if God hath parts, he can be but finite, and so not God; and by consequence, if he be God, he must be acknowledged to be without parts.

---

[n] Pœnitentia Dei est *οἰκονομίας*, i. e. dispensationis mutatio. Theodoret. Quæst. 50. Pœnitentia Dei non est post errorem, sed pœnitentia Dei dicitur rerum sub ejus potestate constitutarum inopinata mutatio. Alioqui certe Deum pœnitere posse negatur. 1 Sam. xv. 29. August.

[o] This was Athanasius's golden rule, always to be observed, when parts or passions are attributed unto God, Ταῦτα *ἀνθρωποπαθῶς μὲν λέγονται, θεοπρεπῶς δὲ νοοῦνται.*

[p] *Ἄνθρωποι μὲν γὰρ ἐκ μερῶν συγκείμενοι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος γενόμενοι συγκείμενον ἔχουσι, καὶ διαλυόμενον τὸν ἑαυτῶν λόγον· ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ὢν ἐστι καὶ οὐ σύνθετος.* Athanas. Oratio contra gent. [41.]

And that God is without passions is also as clear as that he is without body and parts; for passion, in its proper notion and notation, implies suffering, which it is impossible for God, who is a most pure act, to be subject to. Again, in every passion there is a motion or change in the subject wherein it is; and therefore also it is called a *passion*, because the subject suffers some change by it, sometimes loving, then hating, now rejoicing, then grieving, and the like; so that there is some change in the subject from what it was before. But now it is impossible there should be any such motion or change in God; for inconstancy and mutability are imperfections, and therefore not to be admitted into the notion of a Deity. And further, if God should be moved or changed, it must be either from better to worse, from worse to better, or from equal to equal. From better to worse he cannot

[p] MS. *not so much.*

be changed, for then he would be corrupted, and want some perfection after his change which he had before, and so cease to be the chiefest good, and by consequence God; which we have before shewed he cannot, being in and of himself eternal. From worse to better if he should change, before his change he was not God, because he wanted some perfection or degree of goodness which he hath after: after his change he would not be God, because he had a beginning, and so not eternal. From equal to equal also he cannot change, for then too he would not be God absolutely perfect, wanting some perfection before his change which he had after, and some perfection after his change which he had before. And lastly, if God should be moved, or changed, and by consequence be in passion any way, it must be either from something without him or from something within him: from any thing without him, it cannot be; for he is the First Cause, and so the first mover, by whom all other things are moved, and therefore who cannot be moved by any thing: from within he cannot be moved, for he hath not any parts (as I have shewn) whereof one can be the thing moving and the other the thing moved, being in and of himself a most pure and simple act. And therefore we cannot but conclude from reason also, that God is *without body, parts, and passions.*

And this was the doctrine of the ancient fathers. Tertullian[q]: "Neither doth God stand in need of members, or of the offices of several parts, whose very tacit will hath all things present and subservient to it. For why should he desire eyes who is light itself? or why should he require feet who is every where? or why should he go in any where seeing there is nowhere that he can go out of himself? or why should he desire hands whose silent will effecteth all things? neither can he want ears who knoweth the very silent motions of the heart." And Origen: "[r] For the Divine substance is simple or unmixed, neither compounded of any members or joints or affections: but whatsoever is performed by the power of God, that men might understand it, it is either expressed by the names of human members, or else is declared by common and known affections. And after this manner is God said to be angry, to hear, or speak." "For [s] God is one whole Being," saith Athanasius, "not any parts, or made up of several parts, but himself is the maker of the compositions of all things: behold how impiously they speak of God whilst they utter such things! for if he be compounded of parts, he will appear altogether unlike unto himself, and would have his perfection from things unlike to one another." And St. Augustine saith [t], "There are some that presume to say that God himself is altogether a body; thinking, that whatsoever is not a body cannot be a substance: such, I judge, ought utterly to be abhorred." And elsewhere: "[u] If our soul be not a body, how can God the creator of our soul be a body?"

---

[q] Neque sunt ei aut membra, aut membrorum officia necessaria, ad cujus solum etiam tacitum arbitrium, et serviunt, et adsunt omnia. Cur enim requirat oculos, qui lux est? aut cur quærat pedes, qui ubique est? aut cur ingredi velit, cum non sit quo extra se progredi possit? aut cur manus expetat, cujus ad omnia instituenda artifex est et silens voluntas? Nec auribus eget, qui etiam tacitas novit voluntates. Tertull. de Trinitat. [p. 1237. B. ed. Pamelio, fol. Par. 1598. Est tamen Novatiani.]

And as the ancient fathers apprehended God without body and parts, so without passions too. As St. Hilary: "[x] But before we shew what that word of anger and perturbation of wrath is, it behoves me to admonish my hearers and readers that they do not believe that any changes of passions or motion of affections can happen to God. For there is no new thing can come to that eternal and perfect nature; neither can he (who is so, that as he is now he is always, lest sometime he should not be the same) be made to be any thing else than what he always is." "[y] That so," as St. Augustine excellently, "we may understand God, if we can, as much as we can, good without quality, great without quantity, the Creator without indigence, present without site, containing all things without habit, (or compass,) without place every where wholly, eternal without time, making changeable things without any change of himself, and suffering nothing at all." And Athanasius in his dispute with Arius concerning God's begetting of his Son: Arius tells him, "he believed God was not mutable, nor subject to passions, and therefore how could he beget a Son?" To whom Athanasius replies[z], "Neither do we believe that the Divine nature is subject to passions; but faithfully confess, that the Father, who is without passions, did, without passion of himself, who is God, beget the Son, who is God." And Athenagoras shewing that the idols of the heathens were not gods, saith, "[a] But if they should say, they are constituted only of flesh, and have blood, and seed, and are subject to the passions of anger and desire; such words also are to be accounted as trifles, and ridiculous: for there is neither anger, nor lust, nor desire, nor prolific seed in God." And therefore we conclude, that as there is but one God, and this one God is everlasting, so is this one everlasting God *without body, parts, and passions.*

---

[r] Simplex namque est illa substantia, et neque membris ullis, neque compagibus, affectibusque composita: sed quicquid divinis virtutibus geritur, hoc, ut homines possent intelligere, aut humanorum membrorum appellatione profertur, aut communibus et notis annunciatur affectibus. Et hoc modo vel irasci, vel audire, vel loqui dicitur Deus. Orig. in Gen. Hom. 3. [p. 9. B.]

[s] Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ὅλον ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ μέρη, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ διαφόρων συνέστηκεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς τῆς πάντων συστάσεώς ἐστι ποιητής. θέα γὰρ ὅσην ἀσέβειαν κατὰ τοῦ θείου ταῦτα λέγοντες ἐξηγοῦνται; εἰ γὰρ ἐκ μερῶν συνέστηκε, πάντως αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἀνόμοιος φανήσεται, καὶ ἐξ ἀνομοίων ἔχων τὴν συμπλήρωσιν. Athanas. Orat. con. gent. [28.]

[t] Sunt enim quidam, qui Deum ipsum omnino corpus esse præsumunt; putantes quicquid corpus non est, prorsus nullam esse substantiam: istos omni modo aversandos censeo. Aug. [vol. II.] Epist. 112. ad Paulin. [49.]

[u] Porro si noster animus corpus non est, quomodo Deus creator animi corpus est? Id. [vol. VII.] de civitate Dei, l. 8. c. 5.

[x] At priusquam quis iste iræ sermo, et quæ hæc indignationis perturbatio sit, ostendamus, admoneri legentes atque audientes oportet, ne aliquas demutationes passionum, perturbationesque motuum cadere in Deum credant. Nihil enim in æter-

---

nam illam et perfectam naturam novum incidit: neque qui ita est, ut qualis est, talis et semper est, ne aliquando non idem sit, potest effici aliquod aliud esse, quam semper est. Hil. Enar. in Ps. 2. [13.]

[y] Ut sic intelligamus Deum, si possumus, quantum possumus, sine qualitate bonum, sine quantitate magnum, sine indigentia creatorem, sine situ præsentem, sine habitu (vel ambitu) omnia continentem, sine loco ubique totum, sine tempore sempiternum, sine ulla sui mutatione mutabilia facientem, nihilque patientem. Aug. [vol. VIII.] de Trinitat. l. 5. c. 1. [2.]

[z] Sed neque nos passionum conditionibus divinam credimus subjacere naturam; sed impassibilem patrem impassibiliter ex seipso, id est, ex Deo, Deum, quod ipse est, filium generasse fideliter confitemur. Athanas. disput. contra Arium Laodic. hab. [vol. II. p. 637. A., where we read not *ex Deo Deum* but *de eo.*]

[a] Καίτοι εἰ σαρκοειδεῖς μόνον ἔλεγον αὐτοὺς καὶ αἷμα ἔχειν, καὶ σπέρμα, καὶ πάθη ὀργῆς καὶ ἐπιθυμίας· καὶ τότε ἔδει λῆρον, καὶ γέλωτος λόγους τούτους νομίζειν· οὔτε γὰρ ὀργὴ, οὔτ' ἐπιθυμία καὶ ὄρεξις, οὔδε παιδοποιὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ θεῷ. Athenag. leg. pro Christianis, [21.]

Of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness.

Having seen what God is not, we are now to consider what he is: when we speak of imperfections, he is utterly destitute of them, but as for perfections they are all infinite in him; he is without body, without parts, and without passions; but of infinite power, of infinite wisdom, and of infinite goodness. He is of infinite power, so as to do whatsoever is possible to be done: of infinite wisdom, so as to know whatsoever is possible to be known: and of infinite goodness, so as to be more goodness in himself than can possibly be conceived of by us.

First, he is of infinite power, so as to be able to do whatsoever is possible to be done. I say, whatsoever is possible to be done; for whatsoever is impossible to be done, is not within the verge of any power; and so God may have all power, though he cannot do it. Now there is nothing thus in itself impossible, and so nothing that God cannot do, but what in itself implies a contradiction, either directly or consequentially. 1st. Directly; as, for a thing to be and not to be; to be made, and not to be made: such words as these do in their plain sense and signification directly contradict, and so destroy each other. 2ndly. Consequentially; as, that one body at the same time should be in two places, or two bodies at the same time should be in one place: such propositions as these are, though they do not directly and in plain terms imply it, yet they lead one infallibly into a contradiction. So for God to lie, to deny himself, to die, and the like, though the words be not contradictory, yet the sense is: for to say God lies, God denies himself, God dies, are all in effect as much as to say, God is not God. For these are all imperfections, and therefore was God subject to them he would not be God. And so he is omnipotent[b] though he cannot do them: nay, if he could do them he would be impotent, not omnipotent, because to do any thing that argues imperfection doth not proceed from omnipotence but impotence, or want of power to keep himself from being imperfect. Whereas God being so potent as not to be able to be imperfect or impotent is a greater argument that he is omnipotent, so omnipotent as that he cannot be impotent or imperfect, so omnipotent that he cannot but be omnipotent. So that he is so far from being impotent that he is the more[c] omnipotent because he cannot do these things. And this I look upon as the reason why such things as imply contradictions are not possible to be done, because that one part of a contradiction being true the other must needs be false, and therefore should God work that which any ways implies a contradiction, he would necessarily work that which is false[d] and untrue, and therefore that which is contrary, yea, contradictory to his own essence, who is truth itself, and so destroy himself: which if he be God it is a contradiction that he should be able to do, for if he was able to do that, he would not be God, because capable of destruction. So that for God to be able to do that which implies a contradiction doth itself imply a contradiction. And to ask whether God be able to do that which implies a contradiction is the same as if we should ask, whether God be able to destroy himself, to cease to be God, and to become impotent, or of a finite power, which that he should not be able to do is not from any want, but from the [e] perfection of his power and omnipotence: so that

---

[b] Si volunt invenire, quod omnipotens non potest, habent prorsus, ego dicam, mentiri non potest. Credamus ergo quod potest, non credendo quod non potest. Non itaque credentes quod mentiri possit, credant esse facturum quod se facturum esse promisit. August. [vol. VII.] de civit. Dei, l. 22. c. 25. Ergo creditis Deo omnipotenti, qui posse ipsius non potest invenire non posse: tamen aliqua non potest, utpote falli, fallere, mentiri, ignorare, initium et finem habere, non prævi-

---

dere, præterita oblivisci, præsentia non attendere, futura nescire, ad ultimum negare seipsum non potest. Ecce quanta non potest; et tamen omnipotens est, quamvis superius comprehensa non potest. Hom. I. de symb. apost. ascript. S. Chrysost. [Opp. Lat. fol. Par. 1588. vol. V. p. 614. C.]

[c] Deus omnipotens est, et cum sit omnipotens mori non potest, falli non potest, mentiri non potest, et quod ait Apostolus mentiri seipsum non potest; quoniam multa non potest et omnipotens est, et ideo omnipotens est quia ista non potest. Aug. [vol. VI.] de symb. ad catech. l. I. c. I. [i. 2.]

[d] Hence saith St. Augustine; Quisquis itaque dicit, si omnipotens est Deus, faciat, ut quæ facta sunt, facta non fuerint, non videt hoc se dicere, si omnipotens est, faciat ut quæ vera sunt, eo ipso quod vera sunt, falsa sint. Aug. [vol. VIII.] contra Faust. l. 26. c. 5.

[e] St. Ambrose herein expresseth my meaning very clearly. Nunquidnam mentitur Deus? Sed non mentitur, quia impossibile est mentiri Deum. Impossibile quoque istud, nunquidnam infirmitatis est? non utique; nam quomodo omnia potest, si aliquid efficere non potest? Quid ergo ei impossibile? Non quod virtuti arduum, sed quod na-

he would be less powerful if he could do them, and he is more powerful because he cannot do them; his doing them would argue [f] impotence, but his not doing them testifies his [g] omnipotence. If he was not omnipotent he would be able to do them, for he is therefore only unable to do them because [h] omnipotent. Though we need not have gone so far, neither to have rescued the truth of God's omnipotence from the scandal of impotence, because not able to do what implies a contradiction; for seeing every contradiction is in itself an impossibility, and every impossibility is in itself a contradiction to all power; it is no derogation from the infiniteness of God's power not to be able to do them; our meaning, when we say God is omnipotent, or of infinite power, being no more than to say, he is able to do whatsoever himself willeth [i] or pleaseth, (but it is impossible he should please to do what implies a contradiction, for then he would will what is false,

---

turæ ejus contrarium. Impossibile, inquit, est ei mentiri. Impossibile istud non infirmitatis est, sed virtutis et majestatis; quia veritas non recipit mendacium, nec Dei virtus levitatis errorem. Ideoque sit *Deus verax, omnis autem homo mendax.* Veritas itaque semper in eo est: fidelis manet; mutare se et negare non potest. Si enim verum se negat, mentitur: mentiri autem non virtutis, sed infirmitatis est. Nec mutare se potest, quia natura ejus non recipit infirmitatem. Hoc igitur impossibile ejus plenitudinis est, quæ minuere se et augere non potest; non infirmitatis, quæ in eo quod se auget, imbecilla est. Ex quo colligitur impossibile Dei potentissimum esse. Ambros. Epist. 37. [ep. 50. p. 993. vol. II.]

[f] Postremo omnipotens est ad facienda omnia, quæ facere voluerit. Nam ego dico quanta non possit. Non potest mori, non potest peccare, non potest mentiri, non potest falli. Tanta non potest: quæ si posset, non esset omnipotens. Serm. de temp. 213. ascript. August. [vol. V.]

[g] *Πολλὰ τοίνυν εὑρήκαμεν ἀδύνατα τῷ παντοδυνάμῳ θεῷ· ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ δυνηθῆναί τι τούτων ἀπείρου δυνάμεως, οὐκ ἀσθενείας τεκμήριον· τὸ δέ γε δυνηθῆναι, ἀδυναμίας δήπουθεν, οὐ δυνάμεως.* Theodoret. dialog. 3. c. 4. [p. 123. B. vol. IV.]

[h] Neque enim et vitam Dei et præscientiam Dei sub necessitate ponimus, si dicamus, necesse est Deum semper vivere et cuncta præscire: sicut nec potestas ejus minuitur, cum dicitur mori fallique non posse. Sic enim hoc non potest, ut potius, si posset, minoris esset utique potestatis. Recte quippe omnipotens dicitur, qui tamen mori et falli non potest. Dicitur enim omnipotens faciendo quod vult, non patiendo quod non vult: quod si ei accideret, nequaquam esset omnipotens. Unde propterea quædam non potest, quia omnipotens est. August. [vol. VII.] de civit. Dei, l. 5. c. 10. [1.] Vid. de Symb. ad Catech. l. 1. c. 1.

[i] Qui certe non ob aliud vocatur omnipotens nisi quod quicquid vult potest. August. [vol. VII.] de civ. Dei, l. 21. c. 7. [1.] Dicitur enim omnipotens faciendo quod vult, non patiendo quod non vult. Ibid. l. 5. c. 10. [1.] And therefore saith Tertullian, Deo nihil est impossibile, nisi quod non vult. Tertul. [vol. III.] de carne Christi, c. 3.

which, he being truth itself, it is a contradiction he should do,) and whatsoever is in itself such as that it may be done, and so can be the object of any power: for that which is not within the reach of any power is not necessary to be the object of God's power, without which we could not call him an all-powerful God. For though he cannot do that which no power can do, yet he can do all that any power can do, and that is sufficient to denominate him an all-powerful God, or one *of infinite power*, beyond whom no power can go.

And as he is of infinite power, so is he of *infinite wisdom* too, so as to know whatsoever is possible to be known, as well as to do whatsoever is possible to be done. But when we speak of the wisdom or knowledge, we are not to measure it by our understandings and apprehensions of things, who know nothing, but only by species or certain notions abstracted from the things themselves; whereas God knows all things by his own essence, for he knew all things from eternity, and therefore before there was any thing but his own essence to know any thing by: which notwithstanding, being the most perfect idea of all things possible, was sufficient to represent all things to himself, without any thing whatsoever distinct from himself. And again, we can have the actual knowledge only of one thing at a time, in whom the faculty, habit, and act of knowledge are three distinct things: but in God they are all the same thing; who knows all things in himself, being all things to himself; and therefore knows not things by succession one after another, or by discourse of reason, as we do; but he with[k] one simple and eternal act knows all things possible to be known, that is, all things whatsoever. And the reason is clear, for the knowledge of God is the very essence of God, and therefore as the essence of God is but one, the knowledge of God can be but one: so that succession is as competible to his essence as to his knowledge: but that there can be no such thing in his essence as succession of parts, nor by consequence in his knowledge as first and last, is plain, in that his essence (and so his knowledge) is eternal, yea, eternity itself, which excludes all possibility of succession. Again, if God should know one thing after another, what he knows at one time he would not actually know at another; but when he hath the actual knowledge of one thing, he would have but only the power of knowing other things, and so would be compounded of act and power, and by consequence would not be absolutely simple, which notwithstanding that he is, we have proved before. And thus it is that we say God is of *infinite wisdom.*

---

[k] Qui non singula cogitando aspicit, sed una æterna et immutabili atque ineffabili visione complectitur cuncta quæ novit. Aug. de Trinit. l. 15. c. 8. [vol. VIII. l. 15. 13.] Omne præteritum jam non est; omne futurum nondum est: omne igitur præteritum et futurum deest. Apud Deum autem nihil deest: nec præteritum igitur nec futurum, sed omne præsens est apud Deum. Id. de 83. quæst. quæst. 17. de scientia Dei. [vol. VI. p. 4.]

Lastly, he is of *infinite goodness* too, as well as of infinite power and wisdom: where by being of infinite goodness, we are to understand that he is a God infinitely desirable by us, being infinitely amiable in himself: the bottomless ocean of all goodness in himself, and an overflowing fountain of goodness unto us. So that whatsoever good we do enjoy, we receive from him; whatsoever good we can desire, we may have in him. And herein consisteth the right notion of goodness, even in the relation that it bears to us by being convenient for us, and therefore desirable by us. And in this sense is God, and God only, said to be of infinite goodness, that is, such a one of whose convenience to us and desirableness by us there is no bounds or limits; but let him be as much as may be desired by us, he is still more desirable in himself.

And for the proof of all this we shall first consult the scriptures. First, that he is a God of infinite power is certain from scripture, for he is *God Almighty*, Gen. xxxv. 11. *He is wise in heart, and mighty in strength: who hath hardened himself against him and prospered?* Job ix. 4. *Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?* chap. xi. 7. As if he should say, Canst thou find out the bounds and limits of his power and greatness? canst thou tell where it will end and be perfected? is not he infinite in power? Yea, he can *do every thing*, Job xlii. 2. Yea, *he hath done whatsoever he pleaseth*, Psalm cxv. 3. And the reason is, because *with God nothing shall be unpossible,* Luke i. 37.

With men this is unpossible; but with God all things are possible, Matt. xix. 26. And that he is of infinite wisdom also is plain. For he is *the only wise God*, 1 Tim. i. 17; Rom. xvi. 27; Jude 25. *He knoweth all things*, John xxi. 17; 1 John iii. 20. *Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; for all things are naked and opened to the eyes of him with whom we have to do*, Heb. iv. 13. *For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether. Whither* therefore *shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there*, &c. Psalm cxxxix. 4, 7, 8, &c.; and why so, but because he is of infinite wisdom, or, as himself saith, *his understanding is infinite*, Ps. cxlvii. 5.

Lastly, for his goodness, it is called *great goodness*, Ps. cxlv. 7. He is *good to all, and his mercy is over all his works*, ver. 9. Yea, *there is none good but God*, Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 19. None essentially, none originally, none infinitely good but God. Therefore doth David cry out, *whom have I in heaven but thee? neither is there any upon earth my soul desires besides thee*, Psalm lxxiii. 25. And if he be thus the centre of all our desires, he must needs be the perfection of all goodness, or, as it is here expressed, a God of infinite goodness.

The scripture being so plentiful, I need not be prolix in producing reasons to back this truth; especially itself being so clear, that none that hath the right understanding of it can deny subscription to it. For if I say God is God, it will necessarily follow, that he is of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness: for all these are perfections which it is impossible for us to abstract from the notion of a Deity. And not only the things themselves, but the infinitude of them is a perfection also without which God would be imperfect, and so not God. Again, wisdom, power, and goodness, being all perfections, are necessary properties in God, and so the very essence of God; it being impossible for God to be God, and yet to have any thing in him which is not himself; and therefore his essence being infinite, (as it must be if it be the essence of God,) these his properties cannot but be infinite too.

And these reasons serve to prove in general, that all these perfections of power, wisdom, and goodness, are infinitely in

God. We shall now consider them distinctly. And first, as for his power, reason cannot but grant him to be the First Cause, or cause of all causes, and therefore must needs acknowledge him to have all power in his hand; so that nothing can be possible which he cannot do, and therefore he must needs be able to do all things that are possible. Nay, we cannot so properly say God can do any thing because it is possible, as therefore is any thing possible because God can do it; for the possibility of any thing's being done is grounded merely upon God's power and ability to do it: so that the possibility of any thing's being done, as well as the thing itself that is thus possible to be done, must depend upon God as the first cause; otherwise, there would be something in the world which he would not be the cause of. And if to this we consider what God hath or can do, we shall easily grant him to be of infinite power: for God can make any thing of [m] nothing, as when he made the world and all the creatures in it of no preexisting matter; he can make nothing of any thing, there being no greater power required to make any thing nothing, than there is to make nothing any thing: yea, he can make any thing of any thing; of stones he can raise up children to Abraham; and all this he can do with means or without means, or with contrary means, howsoever, whensoever, wheresoever himself pleaseth: so that one thing is not [n] easier or harder to him than another; a whole army is no more able to resist him than a silly fly; he can as easily make ten thousand worlds as one, and any thing in the world as easily as we can think a thought. For he doth but will any thing to be done, and in himself say *fiat*, and immediately whatsoever his will is should be done gathers up itself out of nothing, or some preexisting matter, as himself pleaseth, and becomes just what himself willed should be. And what is, if this be not, to be of infinite power?

---

[m] Εἰ οὕτως ἔστιν ἡ ὕλη ἀγένητος ὡς ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ δύναται ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τοῦ ἀγενήτου ποιῆσαί τι, δῆλον ὡς δύναται ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τοῦ ἁπλῶς μὴ ὄντος ποιῆσαί τι. Justin. in Aristot. Dogmat. evers. [p. 558.]

[n] Sed omnipotens manus tua, cui omnia sunt pari modo possibilia. Nec enim possibilius est creare vermiculum, quam angelum; nec impossibilius est extendere cœlum quam folium; nec levius formare capillum, quam corpus; nec difficilius fundare terram super aquas, quam aquas super terram: sed omnia quæcunque voluit fecit, in cœlo et in terra, et in mari et in omnibus abyssis, et me inter omnia sicut voluit, potuit et scivit. Aug. Soliloq. animæ ad Deum, cap. 9. [vol. VI. App. p. 89.]

Neither can reason discover less of the infinitude of his wisdom than power. For, he being the First Cause, his wisdom must needs be answerable to his power; otherwise let his power be never so great, yet of himself he could do nothing. For if he be not as wise as powerful, what he doth must either be done by chance or by the direction of another: if by chance, then he is not the First Cause, for that is always a necessary, never an accidental cause; if by the direction of another, wanting wisdom in himself, then he would not be the First Cause neither, but rather an instrument in the other's hand to do what he pleaseth: so that to be the First Cause infinite wisdom is required also, as well as infinite power: and not only to be the First Cause, but to be of infinite power, it is also necessary that he be of infinite wisdom, it being impossible for him to do more than he knows: and therefore if his wisdom and knowledge be not, his might and power cannot be infinite; especially considering that impotence, or want of power to know all things, is itself a contradiction to omnipotence in doing all things; this being one thing, which omnipotence must be able to do, or not be omnipotence, even to know all things.

Lastly, reason also is as confident in attributing goodness as wisdom and power, to the Deity; nay therefore because it attributes infinite wisdom and power, it cannot but attribute infinite goodness also to him: for he that is infinitely wise and powerful in himself cannot but be infinitely good; wisdom and power being two perfections much to be desired, and therefore such things as we cannot but term good; the very nature of goodness consisting in desirableness. Again, he that is the chiefest good must needs be of infinite goodness; for otherwise, other things may be as good as he, and then he would not be the chiefest good. Now that God is the chiefest good is certain; for otherwise he would have some other above him: if he be not in all things, and so in goodness too, supreme, he must have a superior, or howsoever an equal, and so himself would not be the first and prime cause, and so not God. But I need not expatiate upon these things, for he that is infinite in one perfection cannot but be so in all: and therefore goodness being a perfection, yea perfection itself, (for goodness and perfection are convertible terms,) he cannot but be of infinite goodness as well as of infinite power and wisdom.

And if we inquire of the Fathers concerning these perfections in God, Justin tells us[o], "God hath not a measured power; therefore to him there is nothing but what is fit to produce whatsoever he pleaseth; neither doth the cutting in pieces nor burning of bodies hinder him that he cannot raise them up again. For God doth not work by the law and measure of nature, but by the power of his own will, which wanteth nothing to produce what he pleaseth." And Tertullian[p]; "They do not know God aright, that do not think that he can do what they do not think." And, "[q]There is nothing difficult to God: who doth not know it? And the things that are impossible with men are possible with God: who is ignorant of it? And God chose the foolish things of this world to confound the wise: all this we have read." And again, "[r]Truly there is nothing difficult to God; but if we use this assertion so abruptly in our presumptions, we might feign any thing of God, as if he hath done it because he can do it. But because he can do all things we are not therefore to believe that he did that also which he never did; but we must inquire whether he did it or no." And Origen;

---

[o] *Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς οὐκ ἔμμετρον ἔχει τὴν δύναμιν· διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲν αὐτῷ ἐστὶν ἀνεπιτήδειον πρὸς ποίησιν πάντων ὧν βούλεται, οὐδὲ κωλύεται ὑπὸ τῆς τομῆς καὶ καύσεως τῶν σωμάτων τοῦ ποιήσασθαι αὐτῶν τὴν ἀνάστασιν. οὐ γὰρ νόμῳ καὶ μέτρῳ φύσεως ἐργάζεται ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλ' αὐθεντίᾳ βουλῆς τῆς ἐν μηδενὶ ἀπορουμένης πρὸς ποίησιν ὧν βούλεται ποιεῖν.* Justin. Quæst. et resp. ad Orthodox. [Quæst. cxi. App. I. p. 488.]

[p] Male Deum norunt, qui non putant illum posse, quod non putant. Tertull. de resur. carnis. [vol. III. c. 38.]

[q] Nihil Deo difficile. Quis hoc nesciat? et impossibilia apud sæculum, possibilia apud Deum quis ignoret? Et stulta mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat sapientia. Legimus omnia. Idem adv. Praxeam, c. 10. [vol. II.]

[r] Plane nihil Deo difficile. Sed si tam abrupte in præsumptionibus nostris hac sententia utamur, quidvis de Deo confingere poterimus, quasi fecerit, quia facere potuerit. Non autem quia omnia potest facere, ideoque credendum est illum fecisse, etiam quod non fecerit. Sed an fecerit, inquirendum. Ibid.

"[s] According to us God can do all things, which being able to do, he doth not therefore desist from being God, and good, and wise." And Damascen, reckoning the various names and properties of God, he brings in this as one; "[t] Power, known by no measure, for it is measured only by his own will; for he can do whatsoever he will." And St. Augustine in his Soliloquies speaks thus to the great God: "[u] Thy almighty hand, which is always one and the same, created angels in heaven and worms upon earth: not higher in those, not lower in these. For as no other hand could make an angel, so neither could any other make a worm: as none else could create heaven, so neither could any one else create the least leaf upon the tree: as none else could make a body, so neither can any one else make an hair black or white; but only thy almighty hand, to which all things are alike possible. For it is not more possible for him to create a worm than an angel; nor more impossible to stretch out the heavens than a leaf."

And concerning the wisdom of God the same Father speaks excellently: "[x] But the Spirit of God is called in scripture *manifold wisdom*, because it hath many things in itself: but what it hath, that it is, and himself alone is all these things. For they are not many but one wisdom, in which there are great and infinite treasures of intelligible things; in which are all the invisible and unchangeable reasons of things, even of such things as are visible and changeable, which were made by it." And elsewhere: "[y] Wherefore if the infinitude of numbers cannot be infinite to the knowledge of God, by which it is comprehended; what are we poor men, that we should presume to set bounds to his knowledge, saying, that unless the same temporal things be repeated over again in the same circuits of times, all things that God hath done he either cannot foreknow that he may do them, or not know them when he hath done them. Whose wisdom, simply manifold and uniformly various, by such an incomprehensible comprehension comprehendeth all incomprehensible things." And St. Hilary; "[z] His wisdom is innumerable, seeing he discerneth all things by their names and number." And as for his goodness, Athenagoras saith, "[a] God being perfectly good is always doing good." Justin Martyr calls him, "[b] The greatest of goods, or the chiefest good." And so St. Augustine; "[c] The chiefest good, above which there is no good, is God: and by this he is the unchangeable, and therefore the truly eternal and immortal good. But all other goods are only from him, not of him." And, to name no more in so plain a case, Tertullian calls him goodness itself; saying, "[d] Goodness said, *Let us make man;* Goodness formed man of the dust of the earth into such a substance of flesh endowed with so many qualities out of one matter; Goodness breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," &c. So that as scripture and reason is clear, so are the Fathers confident in avouching *one living and true God* to be of *infinite wisdom, power, and goodness.*

---

[s] *Δύναται καθ' ἡμᾶς πάντα ὁ Θεὸς, ἅπερ δυνάμενος, τοῦ Θεὸς εἶναι, καὶ τοῦ ἀγαθὸς εἶναι, καὶ σοφὸς εἶναι οὐκ ἐξίσταται.* Orig. contra Cels. l. 3. [70.]

[t] *Δύναμιν οὐδενὶ μέτρῳ γνωριζομένην, μόνῳ δὲ τῷ οἰκείῳ βουλήματι μετρουμένην· πάντα γὰρ ὅσα θέλει δύναται.* Damasc. Orthod. fid. l. 1. c. 8. [init.]

[u] Omnipotens manus tua semper una et eadem, creavit in cœlo angelos, et in terra vermiculos: non superior in illis, non inferior in istis. Sicut enim nulla alia manus angelum, ita nulla possit creare vermiculum: sicut nulla cœlum, ita nulla possit creare minimum arboris folium: sicut nulla corpus, ita nulla ullum capillum album potest facere aut nigrum: sed omnipotens manus tua, cui omnia pari modo sunt possibilia. Nec enim possibilius est ei creare vermiculum, quam angelum; nec impossibilius est extendere cœlum quam folium. Aug. Soliloq. animæ ad Deum, cap. 9. [vol. VI. App. p. 89.]

[x] Ceterum dictus est in scripturis sacris Spiritus sanctus sapientia multiplex, eo quod multa in se habeat: sed quæ habet, hæc et est, et ea omnia unus est. Neque enim multæ sunt, sed una sapientia, in qua sunt immensi quidam atque infiniti thesauri rerum intelligibilium, in quibus sunt omnes invisibiles atque incommutabiles rationes rerum, etiam visibilium et mutabilium, quæ per ipsam factæ sunt. Aug. de civit. Dei, [vol. VII.] l. 11. c. 10. [3.]

---

[y] Quare si infinitas numerorum scientiæ Dei, qua comprehenditur, esse non potest infinita; qui tandem nos sumus homunculi, qui ejus scientiæ limitem figere præsumamus, dicentes, quod nisi eisdem circuitibus temporum eadem temporalia repetantur, non potest Deus cuncta quæ fecit vel præscire ut faciat, vel scire cum fecerit? Cujus sapientia simpliciter multiplex et uniformiter multiformis, tam incomprehensibili comprehensione omnia incomprehensibilia comprehendit. Ibid. l. 12. c. 18.

[z] Innumerabilis sapientia ejus est, cum universa et nominibus discernat et numero. Hilar. Enar. in Ps. 146. [6.]

[a] Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τελείως ἀγαθὸς ὢν, ἀϊδίως ἀγαθοποιός ἐστιν. Athenag. Leg. pro Christ. [26.]

[b] Εἰ γὰρ τῶν ἀγαθῶν τὸ μέγιστον ὁ Θεός ἐστι, &c. Justin. Quæst. et Resp. ad Græcos. [quæst. 1. init.]

[c] Summum bonum quo superius non est, Deus est: ac per hoc incommutabile bonum est; et ideo vere æternum, et vere immortale. Cætera omnia bona non nisi ab illo sunt, sed non de illo. Aug. de natura boni, [vol. VIII.] c. 1. [init.]

[d] Bonitas dixit, Faciamus hominem, bonitas finxit hominem de limo, in tantam substantiam carnis ex una materia tot qualitatibus instructam. Bonitas inflavit animam, &c. Tert. advers. Marc. l. 2. [c. 4.]

The Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible.

WHAT God is in himself he hath manifested himself to be to us, and that both in his word and by his works. His word we shall have occasion to treat of hereafter; his works here, viz. those two great works, (if they may be called two,) his creation and preservation of the world; in both which he hath discovered the truth of that part of the article which we have even now taken off our pen from. For if his power had not been infinite, he would not have been strong enough; if his wisdom had not been infinite, he would not have been wise enough; and if his goodness had not been infinite, he would not have been good enough to have made and preserved such a glorious fabric as the world is we live in. Yea, the glory of all these perfections was wonderfully displayed in his creation of the world. His infinite power appeared not only in making all things of nothing, but also in that he made plants, herbs, and trees before he made the sun, moon, and stars, without which naturally they cannot be produced. His infinite wisdom appeared in that he first made the simple elements, then the mixed bodies; and in that those things were first created which had only a being without life, as all inanimate creatures; then such as had a being and life, but without sense, as plants; then such as had a being, life, and sense, but without reason, as the brute beasts; and then, last of all, such as had a being, life, sense, and reason, as man. And his infinite goodness also discovered itself in that he made the habitations before he made the inhabitants, food before them that were to eat it, and all things that man was to make use of before man that was to make use of them. So well may we say, *He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom; and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion*, Jer. x. 12. And thus hath he manifested himself to be a God of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, by being the maker and preserver of all things;

that is, in that there is nothing in the world besides himself that was not made and is not preserved by himself. The angels above us, the devils below us, the world about us, the souls within us, are all the workmanship of his hands.

First, he is the maker of all things, or he made all things, and that not of any thing, but of nothing; so that before he made it there was nothing at all made. The sun, moon, and stars, with the rest of their fellow creatures, all lay in the barren womb of nothing, not appearing to any, having no being in themselves. This barren womb of nothing did the almighty word of God deliver of the world and all things therein contained; having no preexistent nor coexistent matter to make them of; nor any thing but his own infinite power to make them by. It was the opinion of some ancient philosophers, that out of nothing[e] nothing can be produced: but it is the faith of all sound Christians,[f] that out of nothing all things were created. So that there is nothing but what was made of nothing besides God, who was never made at all, but was himself *the maker* of all things besides himself.

And this must needs be the purport of the words *visible* and *invisible* in the article; which so immediately contradicting one another, cannot but comprehend all things possible within themselves. The things that are seen and the things that are not seen being all understood by them, and therefore the matter also that all things were made of, as well as the things themselves that were made of that matter, must needs be comprehended under them. So that to say God made all things of something is a contradiction: for he that saith there is something which God never made, but made all things of, and yet he made all things, doth plainly contradict himself; that something being also necessarily comprehended under all things.

---

[e] *Πᾶν τὸ γινομένον ἀνάγκη γίνεσθαι ἢ ἐξ ὄντων ἢ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων. τούτων δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐκ μὴ ὄντων γίνεσθαι ἀδύνατον περὶ γὰρ ταύτης ὁμογνωμονοῦσι τῆς δόξης ἅπαντες οἱ περὶ φύσεως.* Aristot. Physic. [vol. II. l. i. c. 4, 4.]

[f] Nemo quærat, ex quibus ista materiis tam magna, tam mirifica opera Deus fecerit. Omnia enim fecit ex nihilo. Lact. de orig. err. [c. ix. vol. I. p. 145.] Igitur in quantum constitit materiam nullam fuisse, ex hoc etiam quod nec talem competat fuisse qualis inducitur, in tantum probatur omnia a Deo ex nihilo facta. Tertull. adv. Hermog. [c. 45.] Qui sua omnipotenti virtute simul ab initio temporis utramque de nihilo condidit creaturam, spiritualem et corporalem, angelicam, viz. et mundanam. Concil. Later. iv. Confes. fid. [vol. VII. p. 15.] *Τὸ γὰρ λέγειν ἐξ ὑποκειμένης ὕλης τὰ ὄντα γεγενῆσθαι καὶ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων αὐτὰ παρήγαγεν ὁ τῶν ἁπάντων δημιουργὸς τῆς ἐσχάτης παραφροσύνης ἂν εἴη σημεῖον.* Chrysost. in Gen. Hom. 2. [vol. I. p. 7. 30.] At si omnipotentem Deum fabricatorem mundi esse concedunt fateantur necesse est ex nihilo eam fecisse quæ fecit. Aug. de fide et symb. c. 2. [vol. VI. p. 152.] Quapropter rectissime credimus omnia Deum fecisse de nihilo: quia etsi de aliqua materia factus est mundus eadem ipsa materia de nihilo facta est. Ibid. Omnipotentem Deum credimus qui omnia faciens factus non est, et ideo omnipotens est quia de nihilo fecit quæcunque fecit. Id. de symb. ad catech. l. 2. c. 3. [vol. VI. p. 558.] Non enim eum aliqua materies adjuvit ex quo demonstraret artis suæ potentiam, sed ex nihilo, ut dixi, cuncta creavit. Ibid.

Neither was he the maker only, but the *preserver* also of all things that were ever made. For when he had produced all things out of nothing, he did not leave them to themselves, as an artificer, who when he hath done his work hath done with his work; no, should God thus leave all things he hath made of nothing to themselves, they would all of themselves again fall down to nothing. And therefore as he at first bestowed their beings upon them, he is still pleased to continue their beings to them; preserving every species by procreation of individuals, and every individual by nutrition proper to itself. And so in the constant vicissitude and orderly succession of one thing after another, there was nothing made by him at the first beginning of time but what is preserved by him from time to time. And so he is not only *the maker*, but also the *preserver of all things visible and invisible.*

And if for the proof of this we consult the scriptures, the first words of them expressly tell us, that *In the beginning God created heaven and earth*, Gen. i. 1; that is, in the first beginning of time, before which there was nothing but eternity; and in the first beginning of all things, before which there was nothing that had a beginning, did God of nothing make all things. First I say, he made all things of nothing; for though the word [g] *barah* may not always signify the production of any thing out of nothing; and so we cannot raise any convincing argument from the word itself, so as to say because God *barah*, therefore he made all things of nothing; yet it cannot possibly be taken in any other sense here than to signify the producing of something, yea, of all things, out of nothing. For suppose the word in itself should import no more than that he made all things: yet here it necessarily implies that he made them of nothing; because it is here expressed that it was in the beginning that he made all things, and therefore before which there was nothing that he could make any thing of. For if there had been any thing he could make any thing of, before he is here said to create heaven and earth, he could not have been said to have created them in the beginning, there being something begun, and so a beginning before that. Secondly, as from these words it may rationally be deduced that he made all things of nothing, so also that of nothing he made all things; I mean, there is nothing in the world but what is comprehended under one of these two words *heaven* and *earth*. And it is usual in the Hebrew tongue, [h] having no one word to express it by, as

---

[g] That ברא doth not always signify the production of any thing out of nothing, is plain, in that it is often used in the same sense with עשה and יצר, which denote only in general to make or form any thing of some preexistent matter; as יוצר אור ובורא חשך עשה שלום ובורא רע *I form the light and create the darkness, I make peace and create evil;* Isa. xlv. 7. and בראתיו יצרתיו אף־עשיתיו *I have created him, I have formed, yea I*

---

have made him; xliii. 7: so that ברא, יצר and עשה *creating, forming,* and *making,* in the language of the scripture, are the same thing. And therefore also whereas it is said ווייצר יהוה אלהים את האדם *And God formed man of the dust of the earth,* Gen. ii. 7, the Chaldee renders it וברא יי *and God created man:* and God himself saith elsewhere ואדם עליה בראתי *and I created man upon it,* Isa. xlv. 12. so that creating of man and forming of man is the same thing: and therefore also saith the Targum elsewhere לאדם דאתברא מן טינא *Man that is created of the dirt;* Job xxx. 19: and אתבריתי מן עפרא *I was created of the dust;* Ps. lxxxix. 48. So that a thing may be נברא created of some preexistent matter as well as nothing, and therefore ברא cannot always denote the production of any thing out of nothing.

[h] There are but two Hebrew words that offer at it, and they are חדל and תבל; both which, I must confess, mostly, if not always, are translated *world:* but properly they denote not the universal, but only the habitable world, even so much of the universe as is inhabited. As for the first, viz. חדל, it is made use of but once in all the Bible; and that is Isai. xxxviii. 11. *I shall not behold man more* עם יושבי חדל *with the inhabitants of the world,* as we render it; but the Targum יתבי ארעא *the inhabitants of the earth;* the Arab. انسانا من السكان بها *any of them that dwell in it,* viz. in the earth before spoken of. Whence we see that the most ancient interpreters took חדל and ארץ to be synonymous terms. And truly from this place it cannot (nor by consequence from any) be proved, that this word signifies any more than the habitable world, the inhabitants of it being here spoken of. But the more usual word that is rendered *world* is תבל;

other languages have, to join these two words, *heaven* and *earth*, together, and under them to comprehend the whole circumference of all created beings; which we call the *world* or *universe.* And there is no place of scripture where they come together, but they are to be taken in that comprehensive sense. And in this God himself seems to be his own interpreter, who in one place saith, *in six days he made heaven and earth*, Exod. xxxi. 17; in another place, that *in six days he made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is,* Exod. xx. 11. And St. Paul most excellently, not only explains the phrase, but confirms the truth, saying, that *by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him*, Col. i. 16. Which place being itself so clear, plain, and full a proof of it, I need not produce any more to prove that God is *the maker of all things, visible and invisible.*

Neither do the scriptures testify his creation only, but his preservation also of all things in the world. For we did not only at the first receive our beings from him, but even now, *in him we live, move, and have our being.* [i] Acts xvii. 28. And

---

made use of very frequently, but never to signify any more than the habitable world neither as חדל; and therefore is it still translated by the Septuagint, *οἰκουμένη.* The Chald. Ps. ix. 9. renders it עמא דארעא *the people of the earth;* the Arabic المسكونة habitata, habitabilis; *the habitable part of the world.* So also Psal. xviii. 16. and xcviii. 7. and elsewhere. The Syr. always retains the Hebrew word ܬܐܒܝܠ The Rabbins contracted the signification of it still narrower than the habitable world, making it to signify no more than the land of Israel; whence R. Salomon speaking of תבל saith, היא ארץ ישראל שהיא מתובלת במצוות הרבה Illa est terra Israelis, quæ condita est præceptis multis, in Isa. xxiv. 4: and these words coming short, there is no word in Hebrew so comprehensive as to signify the whole world. Neither indeed had the Grecians any such word until Pythagoras's time; who seeing the wonderful order of all things, called the compages of all creatures Κόσμος. So Plutarch, *Πυθαγόρας πρῶτος ὠνόμασε τὴν τῶν ὅλων περιοχὴν, κόσμον, ἐκ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ τάξεως.* De placit. philos. l. 2. c. 1. [vol. IV. p. 379.] and from hence did the Latins call it *mundus.*

[i] *Ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καί ἐσμεν. ὥσπερ ἐν σωματικῷ ὑποδείγματι, ὡς ἀδύνατον ἀγνοῆσαι τὸν ἀέρα πανταχοῦ κεχυμένον, καὶ οὐ μακρὰν ἀφ' ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχοντα, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὄντα, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸν Θεόν. παρ' αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐστιν ἡμῖν τὸ εἶναι, τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, τὸ μὴ ἀπολέσθαι.* Œcumen. in loc. [vol. I. p. 138.] And Theophylact, *Τὴν πρόνοιαν αὐτοῦ λέγει καὶ τὴν συγκρότησιν τὸ εἶναι παρ' αὐτοῦ, τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, τὸ μὴ ἀπολέσθαι.* [p. 153.]

not only we, but all things in the world are as well preserved by him, as at the first they received their beings from him: what David saith of some we may apply to all creatures; *These wait all upon thee; that thou mayest give them their meat in due season. That thou givest them they gather: thou openest thine hand, they are filled with good. Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: thou renewest the face of the earth*, Psalm civ. 27—30. Psalm cxlv. 15. It is he *who covereth the heavens with clouds, who prepareth rain for the earth, who maketh grass to grow upon the mountains. He giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry*, Psalm cxlvii. 8, 9. It is he *who giveth us richly all things to enjoy*, 1 Tim. vi. 17. It is he *who stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing. He bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds; and the cloud is not rent under them*, Job xxvi. 7, 8, &c. It is *he* that *maketh his sun to rise upon the evil and upon the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and upon the unjust*, Matt. v. 45. Without whom not so much as *a sparrow shall fall on the ground*. By whom *the hairs of our heads are numbered*, Matt. x. 29, 30. In a word, it is he that *upholdeth all things by the word of his power*[k], Heb. i. 3: without whom therefore nothing in the world could stand; but all things would immediately fall down into their first nothing. So closely do the scriptures hold forth God as *the maker and preserver of all things visible and invisible*.

And though some of the ancient naturalists have been thought to assert the eternity of the world, as [l] Aristotle;

---

[k] Nomen filii Dei magnum et immensum est, et totus ab eo sustentatur orbis. Hermæ discip. Paul. l. 3. [§. 14. p. 75.]

[l] That Aristotle asserted the eternity of the world is plain, in that he states the question in the tenth chapter of his first book de Cœlo: Λέγωμεν μετὰ ταῦτα πότερον ἀγένητος ἢ γενητὸς, καὶ ἄφθαρτος ἢ φθαρτὸς (ὁ οὔρανος) [lib. 1. c. 10.] And then having handled the question in that, he concludes in the beginning of the next book, Ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὔτε γέγονεν ὁ πᾶς οὐρανὸς, οὔτε ἐνδέχεται φθαρῆναι, καθάπερ φασί τινες αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ἔστιν εἷς καὶ ἀΐδιος, ἀρχὴν μὲν καὶ τελευτὴν οὐκ ἔχων τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος, ἔχων δὲ καὶ περιέχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἄπειρον χρόνον, ἔκ τε τῶν εἰρημένων ἔξεστι λαβεῖν τὴν πίστιν. [lib. 2. c. 1.] And this opinion of Aristotle concerning the eternity of the world, is both cited and refuted by Lactantius. Aristoteles autem (saith he) labore se et molestia liberavit,

and others to deny an universal providence; either holding all things to fall out by chance, as the Epicureans, or else from a fatal necessity, without the concurrent providence of a Deity, as the Stoicks; yet we cannot thence conclude it beyond the reach of reason to find the contrary to be true. Nay, certainly if we pass our judgment upon creation and providence from the certain conclusions of unbiassed reason, without having respect to the scriptures at all, it can be no other than that God is as really the maker and preserver of all things, as he is God. For, first, unless he made all things, how can he be termed the First Cause, or by consequence God? unless he be the cause of all causes, how can he be termed the First Cause? and unless he be the cause of all things, how can he be the cause of all causes? And therefore if there be any thing he is not the cause of, or which he did not make, how is he the cause of all things? No certainly, to say he made not all things is as much as to say he is not the First Cause, as really as to say he is not the First Cause is as much as to say he is not God. Again, unless God made all things there is something in the world that was either made by itself, by some other person besides God, or else it was never made at all. To say any thing was made by itself is a contradiction; for then it would be and not be at the same time: it would not be, because not made; it would be, because it could make itself; it being impossible for any thing to act which doth

dicens, semper mundum fuisse: itaque et humanum genus, et cætera, quæ in eo sunt, initium non habere, sed fuisse semper, et semper fore. Sed cum videamus singula quæque animalia, quæ ante non fuerant, incipere esse, et esse desinere: necesse est totum genus aliquando esse cœpisse, et aliquando desiturum esse, quia cœperit. Lactant. de orig. error. c. [11. vol. I. p. 161.] And besides Aristotle, Heraclitus Ephesius also held the eternity of the world, *κόσμον τὸν αὐτὸν ἁπάντων οὔτε τις θεῶν οὔτε ἀνθρώπων ἐποίησεν, ἀλλὰ ἦν ἀεὶ καί ἐστιν*, apud Clem. Alex. Strom. l. [5. p. 711.] And Pliny, Mundum, et hoc quod nomine alio cœlum appellare libuit cujus circumflexu teguntur cuncta, numen credi par est, æternum, immensum, neque genitum neque interiturum unquam; [vol. I. l. ii. c. 1.] But Lucretius elegantly refutes it; l. 5. [325.]

Præterea, si nulla fuit genitalis origo
Terrarum et cœli, semperque æterna fuere:
Cur supera bellum Thebanum, et funera Trojæ,
Non alias alii quoque res cecinere poetæ?
Quo tot facta virum toties cecidere? nec usquam
Æternis famæ monimentis insita florent?
Verum, ut opinor, habet novitatem summa, recensque
Natura est mundi.

not exist. If it was made by any other person besides God, either there must be two infinites, (which I have proved impossible,) or else a finite power must be able to make any thing of nothing, which is impossible also; for upon that very account, because it can make any thing of nothing, it is infinite: for that which can make any thing of nothing, can do any thing at all, there being nothing harder to be done than that; because there cannot be a greater distance betwixt any two things than there is betwixt any thing and nothing, the one being immediately contradictory to the other. And he that can do the hardest thing that is possible to be done cannot have any bounds or limits of his power, and therefore must needs be infinite.

Thus there can be nothing in the world made of itself, or by any other person besides God: it remains therefore, that it was either never made at all, or else made by God. That there should be any thing in the world besides God never made at all, is impossible; for then God would not be the cause of all things besides himself, and so not God. Again, if there be any thing in the world besides God that was never made, it must needs be eternal as God himself: for if it was never made, it had no beginning; if it had no beginning, it must needs be eternal. Now it is impossible any thing should be eternal as God, and not be God; for absolute eternity is a perfection, and therefore cannot but be acknowledged an essential property in God, and so the very essence of God; which therefore no person can have but he that hath the essence of God, which to say any but God can have is a contradiction. This also would quite destroy that old axiom, [m] that every thing that is or hath any being is either the Creator or a creature: so that unless it be the Creator, it is a creature; and if it be not a creature, it is a Creator: which likewise was grounded upon a certain truth, that there must be some First Cause upon which all other causes, and so things, necessarily depend; which if there be any thing neither the Creator nor the creature, neither the First Cause itself nor dependent upon the First Cause, is a manifest untruth: which if granted would make all the logic and reason of all the philosophers in the world to be but dreams and fancies. But that it is not a falsity, but a real truth, such a truth as that the denying of it will force us into a contradiction, I have proved before.

---

[m] Καὶ πρῶτόν γε τὰ ὄντα διαιρήσομεν· εὑρήσομεν γὰρ εἴς τε κτιστὸν καὶ ἄκτιστον τὰ πάντα διαιρούμενα. Εἴ τι γάρ ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς οὖσιν, ἢ ἄκτιστος φύσις ἐστὶν, ἢ κτιστή. Justin. Expos. fid. [4. p. 422.] Ἐν ἔσο γινώσκων, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο σὺ αὐτὸς οὐκ εἶ Θεὸς τῇ φύσει, ἐπειδὴ κτίσμα Θεοῦ, ὡς εἰ μὴ ἦς κτίσμα, Θεὸς ἂν ἦς τῇ φύσει. Athanas. contra Macedon. dialog. I. [14. vol. II. p. 551.]

Having proved the great God to be *the maker* of all things, I need not heap up many arguments to prove he is *the preserver* also of all that he hath made. For the principal reasons which may be brought for the one may be produced for the other too. The great reason why God must be acknowledged the maker of all things, is, because he cannot but be acknowledged the First Cause. And if he be the First Cause, it as necessarily follows that he preserves all things now, as that he made them all at the first. For though he did make all things, and so was the First Cause of all things; yet he cannot be said to be the cause of all things now, unless he preserves them as well as made them. For not only at the beginning of the world, but even now, there are and will be several causes in the world, till the end of it, all which must necessarily depend upon one another, and therefore at the length come to some First Cause, that hath all other causes depending upon it; itself depending upon nothing. Now unless God hath now a hand in the preserving, as well as he had in the making of things, no cause could depend upon him, and so now he would not be the First Cause, and therefore not God.

And if to this we consider how there is as great power requisite for the preserving as for the making of the world, we shall easily find, that as none but God could make it, so there is none but God can preserve it. Now that there is as great power requisite for the one as for the other, is plain. For preservation is commonly defined by some, and acknowledged by all, to be but a continued creation: and they only differ in this, that creation implies the creature to be made now; preservation implies it to be made heretofore. So that creation includes novelty, which preservation excludes; and excludes precedent existency, which preservation includes: but in all things else, and therefore in this also, they agree, that they both proceed from the infiniteness of God's power. Again, either an infinite power is required to preservation as well as creation, or else a finite power can do it: but it is impossible for any finite power to preserve all things; for itself being finite is a creature too, and therefore needs preservation itself as much as the things it is supposed to preserve, and so will all finite powers whatsoever; and therefore we must at length come to an infinite power that preserves all things in the world: and is itself preserved by nothing but itself, and that is God.

But could not God make an independent creature, that needed not the continual concourse of his power to uphold and support it in its being? And may not the world be such a thing? I answer, it is a contradiction, and therefore no derogation from, but the perfection of God's power, that he cannot do it. An independent creature is as much as to say an uncreated creature; for if it be created, it must necessarily depend upon him that created it: yea, to say any thing is an independent creature, is as much as to say, it is both the Creator and the creature; for independency is an essential property of God, and therefore he that is independent must needs be God: and hence it is, that we must conclude that all creatures, and so every thing besides God, in that they are creatures and not God, must necessarily and continually depend upon God their Creator. So that as if he had not made them they could never have been, so if he doth not preserve them they cannot subsist, or continue in their being. So that it is far more impossible for a creature to [n] subsist without

---

[n] Creatoris omnipotentia est causa subsistendi omni creaturæ: quæ virtus si ab iis, quæ condidit, regendis aliquando cessaret, simul omnium rerum species et natura consideret. [Prosp. Aquit. ex] August. [sent. 277. vol. X. App. p. 241.] Qui si non esset, nulla profecto res esset, quæ aliquod nomen substantiamque portaret. Arnob. contra gentes, l. [2. p. 43.] Sic enim se Deus habet ad res, sicut sol ad lunam, quo recedente deficit lumen lunæ. Et sic, si Deus subtraheret suam virtutem a nobis, in momento deficerent omnia. Thom. [Aquin. Comm.] in Coloss. i. [lect. iv. ad calc.] Ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς λέγων, ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι, τὴν διηνεκῆ αὐτοῦ πρόνοιαν ὑμῖν παραδηλοῖ, καὶ ἐργασίαν λέγει τὸ διακρατεῖν τὰ γεγενημένα, καὶ τὴν διαμονὴν αὐτοῖς χαρίζεσθαι, καὶ ἡνιοχεῖν τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον. εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοῦτο ἦν,

God, than for light to subsist without the sun. His *fiat* made them, and his *fiat* can unmake them again. Yea, he put his everlasting arms under them, and immediately raised them out of nothing, and holds them up in their being: if he should take his everlasting arms from under them, they would lose their beings again, and presently drop down to nothing. As take a stone from off the ground, so long as you hold it, it will keep up, but let go your hold, and of itself it will fall down to the ground again from which you took it: so here, God takes us out of nothing: so long as he preserves and holds us up, we subsist; but if he let go his hold, alas! in the twinkling of an eye, we are where we were at first, in nothing. All which things being seriously considered, cannot but extort the confession from any person in the world, that God is *the maker and preserver of all things visible and invisible.*

And this hath been the Christian faith in all ages. The Fathers all agree in it, usually joining them both (viz. creation and providence) together; and therefore I shall not separate them in my citations of them. First Justin Martyr: “[o] But this is the work of Providence (speaking of heaven and earth) which made this universe of various parts, differing both in their nature and use.” The next is Athenagoras: “[p] It behoves them that believe God to be the Creator of the universe, to attribute the custody and care of all things to his wisdom and justice, if they will but stick to their own principles: and seeing they hold this, there is nothing in earth or heaven that they should think to be destitute of this his care and providence; but that the care of the Creator is over all things

---

πῶς ἂν συνέστη τόδε τὸ πᾶν, μὴ τῆς ἄνωθεν χειρὸς κυβερνώσης καὶ διοικούσης καὶ τὰ ὁρώμενα ἅπαντα καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος; Chrysost. in Genes. hom. 10. [vol. I. p. 63.]

[o] *Τὸ δὲ προνοίας ἐστὶν ἔργον, τῆς τόδε τὸ πᾶν ἐκ διαφόρων κατ' οὐσίαν τε καὶ χρείαν μερῶν ποιησάσης.* Justin. Aristot. dogm. evers. [p. 577.]

[p] *Ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς ποιητὴν τὸν Θεὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς παραδεξαμένους, τῇ τούτου σοφίᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τὴν τῶν γενομένων ἁπάντων ἀνατιθέναι φυλακήν τε καὶ πρόνοιαν· εἴδε ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀρχαῖς παραμένειν ἐθέλοιεν· ταῦτα δὲ περὶ τούτων φρονοῦντας, μηδὲν ἡγεῖσθαι μήτε τῶν κατὰ τὴν γῆν, μήτε τῶν κατ' οὐρανὸν ἀνεπιτρόπευτον, μηδ' ἀπρονόητον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀφανὲς ὁμοίως καὶ φαινόμενον, μικρόν τε καὶ μεῖζον, διήκουσαν γινώσκειν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἐπιμέλειαν. δεῖται γὰρ πάντα τὰ γενόμενα τῆς παρὰ τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἐπιμελείας, ἰδίως δὲ ἕκαστον καθ' ὃ πέφυκε, καὶ πρὸς ὃ πέφυκεν.* Athenag. de resur. mortuorum. [18.]

whatsoever, visible and invisible, great and little: for all things that are want the care of their Creator, and every thing peculiarly according to its own nature, and the end it was created for." And Tertullian: "[q] But that which we worship is one God, who in the glory of his majesty, out of nothing brought all that bulk, with every instrument of the elements, bodies, spirits, by his word commanding it, by his wisdom disposing it, by his power perfecting it." And again: "[r] The rule of truth requires that we first believe in God the Father and Lord Almighty, that is, the most perfect Creator of all things; who hanged the heavens on high, and founded the earth below, diffused the seas, and replenished and adorned all these with their proper and condign instruments and furniture." Next to him is Clemens Alexandrinus: "[s] The doctrine that is according to Christ both acknowledgeth the Creator, and that providence reacheth even to particular things." And Arnobius: "[t] Is there any religion more true, profitable, powerful, and just, than to know God to be the chief, and to know to supplicate this chief God, who alone is the head of all good things, and the fountain, the founder and maker of perpetual things, by whom all celestial and terrestrial things are animated and irrigated by vital motion; and who if he was not, truly there could not be any thing that could bear any name or substance?" And so Athanasius: "[u] There is nothing made that was not made, and doth not subsist in and by him." And again: "[x] But as he is good, by his own Word, which is God too, he governeth and constituteth all things, that the creature being illustrated by the guidance, command, and disposition of his Word and Reason, might stand firm; forasmuch as it is admitted into the communion and fellowship with him, who truly is, and from him it received power to exist, that it might not suffer those things by the flowing of its essence which otherwise it would have suffered; I mean, it would not be, unless that Word preserved it, which is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature; because by him and in him doth every thing consist, invisible and visible." And presently after: "[y] For in a moment, at the beck of the Word of God, are all things alike dispensed, and every thing hath what is peculiar to it, and the same order is perfected in all things; for at the beck and by the power of the Divine and paternal Word, the governor and moderator of all things, heaven is turned about, the stars move, the sun displays his light, the moon runs her course, and the air is enlightened by it." And the same Father expounding the Christian faith, begins it thus: "[z] We believe in one unbegotten God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible, having his being of himself." The next is Theodoret: "[a] Behold the providence of God bending itself, and prying into every particle of the creation, shining in them, sounding and even speaking in them." The next is Chrysostom; who upon those words of our Saviour, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*, saith, "[b] What manner of work is this? He looketh over and disposeth all things that are made. When thou seest therefore the sun rising, the moon running, the lakes, and fountains, and rivers, and showers, and the course of nature in seeds and in bodies, both ours and beasts', and all things of which this universe consisteth; learn and consider the continual working of the Father." For as Cyril of Alexandria saith: "[c] Without God and the supreme will, the heavens could not water the earth; neither could the earth bring forth its fruit in season." "[d] Yea, it is from him," as Œcumenius saith, "that we receive both our being, our ability to act, and our preservation from destruction:" so well may the one living and true God be termed *the maker and preserver of all things visible and invisible.*

---

[q] Quod nos colimus, Deus unus est, qui totam molem istam cum omni instrumento elementorum, corporum, spirituum, verbo quo jussit, ratione qua disposuit, virtute qua potuit, de nihilo expressit in ornamento majestatis suæ. Tertull. Apol. adv. gent. [c. 17.]

[r] Regula exigit veritatis, ut primo omnium credamus in Deum patrem et dominum omnipotentem, id est, rerum omnium perfectissimum conditorem, qui cœlum alta sublimitate suspenderit, terram dejecta mole solidaverit, maria soluto liquore diffuderit, et hæc omnia propriis et condignis instrumentis et ornata et plena digesserit. Tertull. [Novatian.] de Trinit. [init.]

[s] Ἡ ἀκόλουθος Χριστῷ διδασκαλία, καὶ τὸν δημιουργὸν ἐκθειάζει, καὶ τὴν πρόνοιαν μέχρι τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἄγει. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. [p. 347.]

[t] An ulla est religio verior, officiosior, potentior, justior, quam Deum principem nosse, scire Deo principi supplicare, qui bonorum omnium solus caput et fons est, perpetuarum pariter fundator et conditor rerum, a quo omnia terrestria cunctaque cœlestia animantur, motuque irrigantur vitali; et qui si non esset, nulla profecto res esset, quæ aliquod nomen substantiamque portaret? Arnob. contra gent. l. [2. init.]

[u] Οὐδέν ἐστιν τῶν ὄντων καὶ γενομένων, ὃ μὴ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἕστηκεν. Athanas. Orat. contra gentes, [42. vol. I. p. 41.]

---

[x] Ἀλλ' ὡς ἀγαθὸς τῷ ἑαυτοῦ λόγῳ καὶ αὐτῷ ὄντι Θεῷ τὴν σύμπασαν διακυβερνᾷ καὶ καθίστησιν, ἵνα τῇ τοῦ λόγου ἡγεμονίᾳ καὶ προνοίᾳ καὶ διακοσμήσει φωτιζομένη ἡ κτίσις, βεβαίως διαμένειν δυνηθῇ, ἅτε δὴ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος ἐκ πατρὸς λόγου μεταλαμβάνουσα καὶ βοηθουμένη δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ εἶναι· μὴ ἄρα πάθῃ ὅπερ ἂν ἔπαθεν, εἰ μὴ ὁ λόγος αὐτὴν ἐτήρει, λέγω δὴ τὸ μὴ εἶναι, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως· ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε τὰ πάντα, τά τε ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα. Ibid. [41.]

[y] Ὑπὸ μιᾶς γὰρ ῥοπῆς νεύματός τινος τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου ὁμοῦ τὰ πάντα διακοσμεῖται, καὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα παρ' ἑκάστου γίνεται, καὶ παρὰ πάντων ὁμοῦ μία τάξις ἀποτελεῖται. Νεύματι γὰρ καὶ ταῖς δυνάμεσι τοῦ ἐπιστατοῦντος καὶ ἡγεμονεύοντος τῶν πάντων θείου καὶ πατρικοῦ λόγου, οὐρανὸς μὲν περιστρέφεται, τὰ δὲ ἄστρα κινεῖται, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἥλιος φαίνει, ἡ δὲ σελήνη περιπολεῖ, καὶ ὁ ἀὴρ μὲν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ φωτίζεται, &c. Ibid. [43, 44.]

[z] Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα ἀγένητον Θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ποιητὴν, ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων, τὸν ἔχοντα ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸ εἶναι. Id. in expos. fid. [init.]

[a] Βλέπετε αὐτὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν πρόνοιαν, δι' ἑκάστου μορίου τῆς κτίσεως διακύπτουσαν, καὶ φαινομένην, καὶ φθεγγομένην, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων βοῶσαν. Theodoret. de provid. serm. 1. [vol. IV. p. 323.]

And in the unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

That there is but one living and true God, was the first part of this article; that in this unity of Godhead there be three Persons is the last: there the Unity of the Godhead, here the Trinity in the Godhead is expressly delivered. A mystery, which though it be not too great for a divine faith to believe, yet it is too high for our human understandings to conceive. And therefore having settled my faith firmly upon it, I am [e] fearful to discourse much about it; being conscious to myself, how easy, and withal how dangerous a thing it is, to mistake and err in so great and [f] unspeakable a mystery as this is. If I think of it, how hard is it to contemplate upon one numerically Divine nature in more than one and the same person; or upon three Divine persons in no more than one and the same Divine nature! If I speak of it, how difficult is it to find out fit words for the explication of it! If I say, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be three, and every one distinctly God, it is true; but if I say, they be three, and every one a distinct God, it is false. I may say, the Divine persons are distinct in the Divine nature; but I cannot say, the Divine nature is divided in those Divine persons. I may say, God the Father is not the Son, God the Son is not the Father, and God the Holy Ghost is neither Father nor Son; yet I cannot say, the Father is not the same God with the Son, or the Son is not the same God with the Father, or the Holy Ghost is not the same God with the Father and the Son. I may say, in the sacred Trinity, or among the Divine persons, there is one before another, and one greater than another; yet I cannot say, in the sacred Deity, or in the Divine nature, there is one greater than another, or one [g] before another. I can say, God the Father is eternal, God the Son is eternal, God the Holy Ghost is eternal; yet I

---

[b] Τίς οὖν τρόπος τῆς ἐργασίας; προνοεῖ καὶ συγκροτεῖ τὰ γενόμενα πάντα. ὁρῶν τοίνυν ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντα, καὶ σελήνην τρέχουσαν, καὶ λίμνας, καὶ πηγὰς, καὶ ποταμοὺς, καὶ ὑετοὺς, καὶ φύσεως δρόμον τὸν ἐν τοῖς σπέρμασι, τὸν ἐν τοῖς σώμασι τοῖς ἡμετέροις, καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἀλόγων, καὶ ἄλλα πάντα δι' ὧν τόδε πᾶν συνέστηκε, μάνθανε τὴν διηνεκῆ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐργασίαν. Chrysost. in Joh. hom. [38. vol. II. p. 708. 20.]

[c] Θεοῦ γὰρ δίχα, καὶ βουλῆς τῆς ἄνωθεν, οὔτ' ἂν αὐτός ποτε τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς οὖσιν ὁ οὐρανὸς, οὔτ' ἂν ἡ γῆ τὸν οἰκεῖον κατὰ καιροὺς ἀναφύοι καρπόν. Cyrill. in Hos. [vol. III. pp. 64, 65. (54 E.)]

[d] Παρ' αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐστιν ἡμῖν τὸ εἶναι, τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, τὸ μὴ ἀπολέσθαι. Œcum. in Act. 17. [vol. I. p. 138.]

[e] De hac re summa et excellentissima modestia et timore agendum est, et attentissimis ac devotis auri-

---

bus audiendum, "ubi quæritur unitas Trinitatis, Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti, quia nec periculosius alicubi erratur, nec laboriosius quæritur, nec fructuosius invenitur." Aug. de Trinit. l. 1. [vol. VIII. p. 752.]

[f] Ἀλλ' *ἄρρητον καὶ ἀνέκφραστον τὸ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος μυστήριον. καὶ μὴ εἴπῃς, πῶς; ὑπὲρ γὰρ πῶς, ἐστὶ τοῦτο· μηδὲ εἴπῃς, ποίῳ τρόπῳ; ὑπὲρ γὰρ τρόπον ὁ θεῖος τρόπος· μηδὲ εἴπῃς, ποίῳ λόγῳ; ὑπὲρ γὰρ λόγον ὁ θεῖος λόγος.* Athanas. Quæst. ad Antioch. 1. [vol. II. p. 269.] And therefore St. Basil advises, *περὶ πατρὸς, καὶ υἱοῦ, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μὴ συζητεῖν, ἀλλ' ἄκτιστον καὶ ὁμοούσιον Τριάδα μετὰ παρρησίας λέγειν καὶ φρονεῖν, καὶ τοῖς ἐπερωτῶσι λέγειν, ὅτι βαπτίζεσθαι δεῖ ὡς παρελάβομεν, πιστεύειν δὲ ὡς βεβαπτίσμεθα.* Basil. de askesi, [vol. II. p. 383.]

[g] Ἐπὶ *τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος οὐδεὶς πρῶτος, καὶ οὐδεὶς ὕστερος, ἀλλ' ἅμα πατὴρ, ἅμα υἱὸς, ἅμα πνεῦμα ἅγιον. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ συνανάρχοι λέγονται, καὶ ἄναρχοι· ἄναρχον δὲ λέγεται τὸ πρὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὄν. ἄναρχος λοιπὸν ὁ πατὴρ, ἄναρχος ὁ υἱὸς, ἄναρχον τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. καὶ οὐχ ὁ μὲν πρῶτος, ὁ δ' ὕστερος· ἀλλ' ἅμα οἱ τρεῖς, πατὴρ, υἱὸς, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ συνάναρχοι καί εἰσιν, καὶ ὀνομάζονται.* Athanas. Quæst. 13. tom. ii. p. [339.] *Καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ Τριάδι, οὐδὲν πρῶτον, ἢ ὕστερον· οὐδὲν μεῖζον, ἢ ἔλαττον· ἀλλ' ὅλαι αἱ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις συνδιαιωνίζουσαι ἑαυταῖς εἰσι, καὶ ἴσαι.* Id. in symb. [vol. II. p. 728.]

cannot say there are three eternals. I may say, the Father is one God, the Son is one God, the Holy Ghost is one God; yet I cannot say, the Father is one God, the Son is another God, and the Holy Ghost is a third God. Again, I may say, the Father begot the Son, the Son was begotten of the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son; and so he that was God begot him that was God, and a third person, who was God too, proceeded from two, each of which was God; yet I cannot say, one God begot another God, or from two Gods issued forth a third God. Or thus, I may say, the Father begat another, who was God; yet I cannot say, he begat another [h] God: and from the Father and the Son proceeded another, who is God; yet I cannot say, from the Father and the Son proceed another God. For all this while, though their nature be the same, yet their persons are distinct; and though their persons be distinct, yet their nature is the same. So hard a thing is it to word so great a mystery aright, or to fit so high a truth with expressions suitable to it, without going one way or other awry from it.

Hence it is that I shall not use many words about it, lest some or other slip from me unbecoming of it. In brief therefore, here it is said, that in the unity of the Godhead there be three Persons; that is, though there be but one living and true God, yet there are three Persons, who are that one living and true God. Though the true God be but one in substance, yet he is three in subsistence; and so three in subsistence as still to be but one in substance. And these three Persons, every one of which is God, and yet all three but one God, are really related to one another: as they are termed in the scripture, one is a Father, the other a Son, the other an Holy Ghost. The first is Father to the second; the second is Son to the first; the third is neither Father nor Son, but the issue or Spirit of both. The first was a Father from eternity, as well as God; the second was God from eternity, as well as a Son; the third was both Holy Ghost and

---

[h] Pater genuit alium, viz. filium, non autem alium Deum, sed aliam personam. August.

God from eternity, as well as either of them. The Father is the first person in the Deity; not begotten, nor proceeding, but begetting: the Son the second person; not begetting nor proceeding, but begotten: the Holy Ghost the third; not begotten, nor begetting, but proceeding. The first is called the Father, because he begot the second; the second is called the Son, because he is begotten of the Father; the third is called the Holy Ghost, because breathed both from the Father and the Son.

And though these be really thus amongst themselves distinct from one another, yet are they not distinct in the Divine nature: they be not distinct in essence, though they be distinct in the manner of their subsisting in it. The Father subsists as a Father; the Son as a Son; the Holy Ghost as a Spirit; and so have distinct subsistences, yet have all the same numerical substance[i]. I say numerical or individual substance; for otherwise they might have all the same Divine nature, and yet not be the same God. As Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were three distinct persons, that had all the same human nature, yet they could not all be called one man; because, though they had but one human nature, yet they had it specifically as distinguished into several individuals; not numerically so as to be the same individual man: and therefore, though they had but one specifical, they had several numerical natures; by which means Abraham was one man, Isaac another, Jacob a third. And upon the very same account is it, that among the angels, Gabriel, Michael, Raphael, though they have the same angelical nature, yet they are not the same angel. But here the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost have not only the same Divine nature in *specie*, but in *numero;* and so have not only one and the same nature, but are also one and the same God. The Father is the selfsame individual God with the Son; the Son is the selfsame individual God with the Father; and the Holy Ghost is the selfsame individual God with them both. I say, individual God; for the Divine nature is not [k] divided into several Gods, as the human is into several men; but only distinguished into several persons; every one of which hath the same undivided Divine nature, and so is the same individual God. And thus it is, that *in the unity of* the *Godhead there be three persons*, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which great mystery, though we be not able to conceive of it, yet the scriptures give a sufficient testimonial to it.

---

[i] So ed. 1716. The MS. has *subsistence.*

[k] Ἀδιαίρετος γὰρ ἐν ταῖς τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν ἡ τῆς μιᾶς οὐσίας Θεότης. Athan. in Quæst. ad Antioch. 1. [vol. II. p. 268.]

Now though this mystery hath received great light by the rising of the Sun of righteousness upon the world, yet it did not lie altogether undiscovered before; there being sufficient testimonies in the Law as well as in the Gospel of it. I shall make use of both, that by the mouth of two infallible witnesses, (the Law and Gospel,) this great truth may be established. First, of the Old Testament, which will furnish us with several testimonies of it, though not with so many as commonly are forced from it. God being so frequently styled *Elohim*, and saying in the first of Genesis, [k] *Let us make man*, may denote a plurality, but cannot convince any gainsayer of a trinity of persons in the sacred Deity. And the angels crying, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts*, Isai. vi. 3, may be a stronger argument for the supereminent sanctity, than for the sacred Trinity in the Divine nature.

But there are two or three places which seem to be very convincing; as, *The Spirit of the Lord spoke by me, and his word by my tongue*, 2 Sam. xxiii. 2. Where we have Jehovah, the Spirit of Jehovah, and the Word of Jehovah, which is his

---

[k] Tertullian makes use of this place to prove the Trinity. Si te adhuc numerus scandalizet Trinitatis, quasi non connexæ in unitate simplici, interrogo quomodo unus et singularis pluraliter loquitur? Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem *nostram*; cum debuerat dicere, Faciam hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem *meam*; utpote unicus et singularis? Sed et in sequentibus, Ecce Adam factus est tanquam unus ex nobis. Fallit aut ludit; ut cum unus, et solus, et singularis esset, numerose loqueretur: aut nunquid angelis loquebatur, ut Judæi interpretantur, quia nec ipsi Filium agnoscunt? An quia ipse erat Pater, Filius, Spiritus, ideo pluralem se præstans, pluraliter sibi loquebatur? Imo quia jam adhærebat ei Filius, secunda persona, sermo ipsius; et tertia, Spiritus in sermone, ideo pluraliter pronunciavit, faciamus, et, nostram, et, nobis. Tertull. adv. Prax. cap. 12. And Justin to the same purpose; Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο τὸ τῷ ὄντι ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς προβληθὲν γέννημα, πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων συνῆν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τούτῳ ὁ πατὴρ προσομιλεῖ. Dialog. cum Tryph. [62.]

Son, as I shall shew afterwards, plainly and distinctly set down together. So also, *by the Word of Jehovah were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth*, Psalm xxxiii. 6. Where we have again Jehovah himself, his word, and his breath or Spirit distinctly expressed. And again, *Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my Spirit upon him, and he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles*, Isai. xlii. 1. Where Jehovah the Lord is speaking of Christ his servant, there are two persons; and saith, he will put his Spirit upon him, there is the third.

Thus we might discover this truth even in the Old Testament, but in the New we can scarce look over it. Where we may read how, when Jesus was baptized, *the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*, Matt. iii. 16. Had we, who know nothing but by our senses, been present at this time with Jesus at Jordan, our very senses would have conveyed this truth to our understandings, whether we would or no. Here we should have heard a voice from heaven; whose was it but God the Father's? Here we should have seen Jesus coming out of Jordan; who was that but God the Son? And here we should have seen something else too, in the form of a dove; and who was that but God the Spirit? Thus was God the Father heard speaking; God the Son seen ascending; and God the Holy Ghost descending upon him. The first was heard in the sound of a [1] voice; the second was seen in the form of a man; the third was beheld in the shape of a dove. O mystery of mysteries! that so high a mystery should be brought within the reach of sense!

---

[1] Et ecce columba descendit super Dominum baptizatum; et apparuit ibi sancta illa et vera Trinitas, quæ nobis unus Deus est. Adscendit enim Dominus ab aqua, sicut in Evangelio legimus, et ecce aperti sunt cœli, et vidi Spiritum descendentem sicut columbam, et mansit super eum: et statim vox consecuta est, Tu es Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi bene complacui. Apparuit manifestissime Trinitas, Pater in voce, Filius in homine, Spiritus Sanctus in columba. Aug. in Joh. tract. 6. [5. vol. III. pars ii.] Pater auditur in voce; Filius manifestatur in homine; Spiritus Sanctus dignoscitur in columba. Id. And another elegantly, in his poetical strain: Voce pater, natus corpore, flamen ave.

Thus we read how Christ, when upon earth, said, when he went to his Father, *he would pray him, and then he would send the Spirit*, John xiv. 16, 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7. 13, 14, 15: where we may observe the Son praying the Father, the Father hearing the Son, and both of them sending the Holy Ghost. Thus saith the angel to Mary; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that Holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God*, Luke i. 35: where God the Father sends an angel unto Mary; God the Son is promised to be born of her; and therefore God the Holy Ghost to overshadow her. Thus it is said, *God* (the Father) *hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts*, Gal. iv. 6. And therefore the apostle wishing all happiness to the Corinthians, concludes his Epistle with a holy prayer to all the Persons in the sacred Trinity for them, saying, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all*, 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

There is still behind, besides some other that it might be proved from, one eminent place to confirm this truth: *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, Matt. xxviii. 19. As the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost appeared together when John baptized Christ; so must all Christians, that thenceforth shall be baptized, be baptized in the name of all three. Where we have observable the Trinity in the Deity, the Deity of the Trinity, and the order of the persons in that Divine Trinity. 1st. The Trinity in the Deity; for here are plainly three; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 2ndly. The Deity of the Trinity, that every person is God; for here Divine worship is to be performed to them all; and all that profess the true religion must be baptized in the name of every one as well as of any one of them: and 3rdly, here is the order betwixt the sacred persons in the Deity; first, the Father; secondly, the Son; thirdly, the Holy Ghost.

It is clear therefore, that there are no more and no fewer persons in the sacred Deity than three; but how doth it appear that these three persons are all but one God? Plainly; *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the*

Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one, 1 John v. 7, that is, one God. Though this place of scripture be not extant in many ancient manuscripts, nor indeed in many ancient translations; yet in the days of [m] Arius, the grand oppugner of this truth, about three hundred and thirty years after Christ, it was never so much as questioned, and many of the ancient [n] fathers quote it. Which plainly shews that it was then received as canonical scripture, and therefore not to be questioned by us now.

And if we proceed to reason, here also, though the unity of the Godhead be a truth which from natural principles may easily be demonstrated, yet the Trinity in the unity is a mystery which by the light of nature could never be discovered: forasmuch as our senses cannot perceive it, our tongues cannot express it, our experience cannot teach it, neither can our reason comprehend it.

It is true, Trismegist, Plato, and others seem by the light of reason to have seen into this hidden mystery: but if we weigh their words and sentences, we shall find they speak of three Divine essences, rather than of three distinct persons in the same essence. And the glimmering light they had is thought to be borrowed from such as had seen or heard of the scriptures, rather than to have sprung from their own reasons. It is true also, that reason may offer at some dark resemblances of this great mystery; [o] as, the sun begets beams, and from the sun and beams together proceed light and heat; yet one is not before another, but only in order and relation to one another. [p] So in waters, there is the fountain or well-head; then there is the spring that boils out of that fountain; then there is the stream that proceeds from both the fountain and the spring; and all these are but one and the same water. So God the Father is the fountain of Deity; the Son, as the spring, boils up out of that fountain; and the Holy Ghost, that flows from both. But such and the like instances may serve to illustrate this mystery to such as do believe it, but are no demonstrations of it to such as do deny it.

---

[m] That it was not questioned in the days of Arius is plain, in that if it had, certainly Arius himself would have excepted against it when it was produced against him. For when Athanasius and he disputed concerning this truth in the Nicene council, Athanasius brings this amongst other places of scripture to prove it: *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις πᾶσιν*, (saith he to Arius) *Ἰωάννης φάσκει, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς τὸ ἕν εἰσίν.* [44. vol. II. p. 229.] And Arius makes no exception at all against the authority of the place, as we may see towards the end of the said dispute, in the [second] volume of Athanasius's works; which without doubt he would have done, if it had been then questioned.

[n] Dicit Dominus ego et Pater unum sumus, et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, et tres unum sunt. Cypr. de simpl. præl. [p. 109. de unit. eccl.] And besides the place before quoted, Athanasius mentions it again in his first book, De unita Deitate Trinitatis ad Theophilum, in these words; Et unitum nomen naturale clause est declaratum dicente Johanne evangelista in epistola sua, Tres sunt qui testimonium dicunt in cœlo, Pater et Verbum et Spiritus. [vol. II. pp. 606, 7.] And Fulgentius, In Patre ergo et Filio et Spiritu S. unitatem substantiæ accipimus personas confundere non audemus. Beatus enim Johannes apostolus testatur dicens, Tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus, et tres unum sunt. Fulgent. in object. Arian. discus. object. 10. [p. 176.] V. et Hieron. in prolog. epist. canon. [vol. X. p. 1057.]

That which looks the most like a reason is drawn from God's understanding and knowing of himself, and so in himself begetting the lively image of himself, (as a man that looks in a glass begets the image of his own face,) and this is the second Person in the Trinity, called therefore *the express image of his Father's person:* and from this God's looking upon himself, and representing himself to himself, cannot but proceed delight and rejoicing in himself; whereby the Father and the Son delight in one another (as a man looking in a glass, if he smiles, his image in the glass smiles too, and seems to do whatsoever himself doth); and this mutual love to and joy in one another, is a third manner of being or subsistence in the Godhead, called the Holy Ghost. But these and the like are subtle speculations rather than solid arguments, and have more of a roving fancy than of convincing reason in them. Neither did I ever read or hear of any reason brought from natural principles for this mystery, but what by gainsayers might easily be evaded; not because it is contrary (to), but because it is above reason. But howsoever that the Son is God, we shall prove in the next; that the Spirit is God, we shall prove in the fifth article; and that the Father is God, is acknowledged by all; and yet that there is but one God, we have proved before: from whence it will clearly follow, that there are three Persons, every one of which is God, and yet there is but one God.

---

[o] Something like to this is the simile of Athanasius: Ὥσπερ ἥλιος ἔνι εἷς, ὁ δὲ ἥλιος ἔχει ἀκτῖνα καὶ φῶς, καὶ εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ τρία πρόσωπα, δίσκος, ἀκτὶς, καὶ φῶς· καὶ δίσκος μὲν καυχίον τοῦ ἡλίου, ἀκτὶς δὲ καταβαινομένη λαμπαδοφανῶς καὶ κρούουσα πρὸς τὴν γήν· φῶς δὲ, τὸ φωτίζον καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἐπισκιώδεις τόπους χωρὶς ἀκτῖνος. καὶ ἰδοὺ πρόσωπα μὲν τρία, δίσκος, ἀκτὶς, καὶ φῶς, οὐ λέγομεν δὲ τρεῖς ἡλίους, ἀλλ' ἕνα ἥλιον, οὐδὲ λέγομεν πρόσωπον ἕν, ἀλλὰ πρόσωπα τρία· ἐὰν γὰρ ἐρωτηθῇς, ὅτι πόσοι ἥλιοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, μέλλεις εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἥλιος εἷς ἐστιν· εἰ δ' ἐρωτηθῇς, ὅτι πρόσωπα τοῦ ἡλίου πόσα ἐστὶ, μέλλεις εἰπεῖν ὅτι τρία, δίσκος, ἀκτὶς, καὶ φῶς· οὕτως νόει καὶ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Θεὸς μὲν εἷς, πρόσωπα δὲ τοῦ ἑνὸς Θεοῦ τρία. Athan. Quæst. al. tom. ii. p. [336.]

[p] This is that which Ruffinus seems also to resemble this mystery by: De apertioribus requiramus. Fons quomodo ex se generat fluvium, quo autem spiritu rapidum fertur fluentum? Quod quidem cum unum et inseparabile sit et fluvius et fons, tamen nec fons fluvius nec fluvius fons intelligi aut appellari potest: et tamen qui viderit fluvium, videt et fontem? Exerce te prius in horum explanatione, et discute, si potes, quæ habentur in manibus, et tunc ad horum sublimiora veniamus. Ruffin. in Expos. Symboli. [p. 18.]

And this was the ancient doctrine of the church of Christ. [q] Justin Martyr saith expressly: "Truly there is one God over the whole universe, who is made known or acknowledged in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For seeing the Father of his own substance begot the Son, and issued forth the Spirit, there is all the reason in the world that they that have one and the same essence should be acknowledged to have one and the same Divinity." And again: [r] "It is fit therefore that we should acknowledge and confess one God, made known unto us in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, acknowledging the several subsistences of one Deity; but as God, understanding the communion of those subsistences in the same essence. For Unity is understood in the Trinity, and Trinity is acknowledged in that Unity." And elsewhere: [s] "There is one God in the coexistency of three Divine persons or subsistences; which are differenced from one another, not in their essence, but in manner of subsistence. But the difference of the manners of existence doth not divide or difference what is in the essence." And so Gregory Nyssen: [t] "In his essence he is but one; and therefore God commanded that they should look but upon one Name: but by the known properties or subsistences, it is distinguished into the faith of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And so Liberius in his Epistle to Athanasius: [u] "For neither the Son nor the Spirit is divided from the essence of the Father, which filleth heaven and earth. There is therefore, as I said before, a Trinity in one substance, undivided, but one in essence, one in Deity, one in power, one in dominion, one in glory, one in likeness, and one in Spirit, for the Spirit is not divided." And Athanasius sends him word back again: [x] "And therefore is our faith in one God, the Father Almighty, and in his Son the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost. For these are of one unity, one power, one substance, one essence, one glory, one dominion, one kingdom, in the image of the Trinity, consubstantial; by whom all things were made." And there are amongst others three questions, which Athanasius answers, that make much to clear this mystery, as well as to shew the judgment of the Fathers upon it. [y] First, "What is common to the holy Trinity?" To that he answers; [z] "The essence is common; the eternity is common; the power is common; the goodness is common; the wisdom, the justice is common: for the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost have all things common, or equally, but only their distinct properties. For it is the property of the Father to be unbegotten; of the Son to be begotten; and of the Holy Ghost to proceed." Secondly, [a] "How many essences dost thou acknowledge in God? I say, there is one essence, one nature, one form, one kind, one glory, one dignity, one dominion." But, thirdly, [b] "How many Persons dost thou acknowledge in God? I acknowledge three Persons, three subsistences, three properties, three individuals, three characters."

---

[q] Εἷς οὖν ταῖς ἀληθείαις ἔστιν ὁ τῶν ἁπάντων Θεὸς, ἐν πατρὶ, καὶ υἱῷ, καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι γνωριζόμενος. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας οὐσίας ὁ πατὴρ τὸν υἱὸν ἀπεγέννησεν, ἐκ δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς τὸ πνεῦμα προήγαγεν, εἰκότως ἂν τὰ τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ μιᾶς οὐσίας μετέχοντα, τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ μιᾶς θεότητος ἠξίωνται. Justin. Expos. fidei de rect. confess. [2. p. 420.]

[r] Ἕνα τοίνυν Θεὸν προσῆκεν ὁμολογεῖν ἐν πατρὶ, καὶ υἱῷ, καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι γνωριζόμενον· ᾗ μὲν πατὴρ, καὶ υἱὸς, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον τῆς μιᾶς θεότητος τὰς ὑποστάσεις γνωρίζοντας· ᾗ δὲ Θεὸς τὸ κατ᾽ οὐσίαν κοινὸν τῶν ὑποστάσεων νοοῦντας. μονὰς γὰρ καὶ ἐν τριάδι νοεῖται, καὶ τριὰς ἐν μονάδι γνωρίζεται. Ibid. [7.]

[s] Εἷς ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς τῇ συνυπάρξει τῶν τριῶν θείων ὑποστάσεων, τῶν διαφερουσῶν ἀλλήλων, οὐ τῇ οὐσίᾳ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῆς ὑπάρξεως τρόποις. ἡ διαφορὰ δὲ τῶν τῆς ὑπάρξεως τρόπων οὐ διαιρεῖ τὸ ἓν τῇ οὐσίᾳ. Id. Quæst. et resp. ad Orthod. Quæst. 139. [p. 502.]

---

[t] Τῷ μὲν γὰρ νόμῳ τῆς οὐσίας ἕν ἐστι· διὸ καὶ εἰς ἓν ὄνομα βλέπειν ὁ δεσπότης ἐνομοθέτησε· τοῖς δὲ γνωριστικοῖς τῶν ὑποστάσεων ἰδιώμασιν, εἰς πατρός τε καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πίστιν διῄρηται. Nyssen. contra Eunom. l. 2. [vol. II. p. 431.]

[u] Οὐ γὰρ μερίζεται ὁ υἱὸς ἐκ τῆς πατρικῆς ὑποστάσεως, οὐδὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τῆς πληρούσης τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. ἔστιν οὖν, καθὼς προεῖπον, ἡ τριὰς ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει μὴ μεριζομένη, καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἕν· καὶ τῇ Θεότητι ἕν· καὶ τῇ δυνάμει ἕν· καὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ ἕν· καὶ τῇ δοξολογίᾳ ἕν· καὶ τῇ εἰκόνι ἕν· καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ἕν· πνεῦμα γὰρ οὐ μερίζεται. Liberii Epist. ad Athanas. inter Athanas. opera. tom. [II. p. 664.]

[x] Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν ἐστιν, εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. ταῦτα δὲ ἐξ ἑνότητος μιᾶς, δυνάμεως μιᾶς, ὑποστάσεως μιᾶς, οὐσίας μιᾶς, δοξολογίας μιᾶς, κυριότητος μιᾶς, βασιλείας μιᾶς· εἰκόνος τῆς Τριάδος ὁμοούσιον· δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. Athanas. rescript. ad Liber. [ibid. p. 665.]

[y] Τί τὸ κοινὸν τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος;

[z] Κοινὸν ἡ οὐσία· κοινὸν τὸ ἄναρχον· κοινὸν ἡ δύναμις, ἡ ἀγαθότης, ἡ σοφία, ἡ δικαιοσύνη. πάντα γὰρ ἐξ

But indeed there is scarce any of the Fathers but offer themselves to bear witness to this truth; but I shall add only some select places out of St. Austin that make for the explanation, as well as confirmation of it. [c] "But the Trinity," saith he, "is only one God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: not as if the Father was the same Person with the Son, or the Holy Ghost the same Person with the Father and Son; seeing there is in the Holy Trinity the Father of the only Son; the Son of the only Father; and the Holy Ghost, the Spirit both of the Father and Son: but by reason of one nature, and inseparable life, the Trinity (as far as man by faith can pry into it) is understood to be our one Lord God, or, our one Lord God is the Trinity itself; of whom it is said, *Thou shalt worship the Lord, and him only shalt thou serve.*" And presently after: [d] "And all these are not confusedly

---

ἴσου ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, πλὴν τῶν ἰδίων αὐτῶν. ἴδιον γὰρ τοῦ μὲν πατρὸς τὸ ἀγέννητον. τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ τὸ γεννητόν· τοῦ δὲ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὸ ἐκπορευτόν. [Athanas. Quæst. al. vol. II. p. 339.]

[a] *Ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ πόσας οὐσίας ὁμολογεῖς; Μίαν οὐσίαν λέγω, μίαν φύσιν, μίαν μορφὴν, ἓν γένος, μίαν δόξαν, μίαν ἀξίαν καὶ κυριότητα.* [ibid.]

[b] *Ὑποστάσεις δὲ πόσας ὁμολογεῖς; Τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ὁμολογῶ, τρία πρόσωπα, τρία ἴδια, τρία ἄτομα, καὶ τρεῖς χαρακτῆρας.* Athanas. [ibid.]

[c] Sed ipsa Trinitas unus Deus solus, Pater, Filius et Spiritus Sanctus: non ut Pater sit ipse qui Filius, vel Spiritus Sanctus ipse sit qui Pater aut Filius, cum sit in illa Trinitate Pater solius Filii, et Filius Patris solius, Spiritus autem Sanctus et Patris et Filii sit Spiritus: sed propter unam eamdemque naturam atque inseparabilem vitam, ipsa Trinitas, quantum ab homine potest, fide præcedente intelligitur unus Dominus Deus noster, de quo dictum est, Dominum Deum tuum adorabis, et illi soli servies. Aug. Epist. ad Maximum, [clxx. 3. vol. II. p. 609.]

[d] Et hæc omnia nec confuse unum sunt, nec distincte tria sunt: sed cum sunt unum, tria sunt, et cum sunt tria, unum sunt. *Ibid.* [5.]

one, nor distinctly three; but they are so one as to be three, and so three as to be one." And again: [e] "This Trinity is of one and the same nature and substance; not less in every one than in all, nor greater in all than in every one: but as much in the Father only, or in the Son only, as in the Father and Son together; and as much in the Holy Ghost only, as it is both in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost together." And elsewhere: [f] "Wherefore the true God is a trinity in persons, but one in nature: and by this natural or essential unity the whole Father is in the Son and Holy Ghost; the whole Son in the Father and the Holy Ghost; and the whole Holy Ghost in the Father and Son. None of them without any of the other; because none of them preceded the other in eternity, exceeds in greatness, or excels in strength." And lastly, in another place he saith; [g] "Plainly therefore, and without all doubt, it is to be believed, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one Almighty God, eternal, unchangeable: and every one of these is God, and all of them but one God: and every one of them is a full and perfect eternal substance, and altogether but one substance: for whatsoever the Father is, as he is God, as he is substance, as he is eternity, that is the Son, that is the Holy Ghost: and so whatsoever the Son is, as he is God, as he is substance, as he is eternity, that is the Father, that is the Holy Ghost: and whatsoever the Holy Ghost is, in that he is God, in that he is substance, in that he is eternity, that is the Father, that is the Son: and therefore in all three there is but one Divinity, one essence, one omnipotence, and what else can be spoken substantially of God."

---

[e] Hæc Trinitas unius est ejusdemque naturæ et substantiæ; non minor in singulis, quam in omnibus, nec major in omnibus, quam in singulis; sed tanta in solo Patre, vel in solo Filio, quanta in Patre simul et Filio; et tanta in solo Spiritu Sancto, quanta simul in Patre Filio et Spiritu Sancto. *Ibid.*

[f] Propterea ipse verus Deus in personis Trinitas est, et in natura unus est. Per hanc unitatem naturalem totus Pater in Filio et Spiritu Sancto est, totus Filius in Patre et Spiritu Sancto est, totus quoque Spiritus Sanctus in Patre et Filio. Nullus horum extra quemlibet ipsorum est: quia nemo alium aut præcedit æternitate, aut excedit magnitudine, aut superat potestate. August. de Fide; ad Petrum, cap. 1. [vol. VI. App. pp. 19, 20.]

[g] Plane ergo et absque omni dubitatione credendum est Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum unum esse Deum omnipotentem, æternum, incommutabilem: et singulus horum Deus, et simul omnes unus: et singulus quisque horum plena et perfecta æterna substantia, et simul omnes una substantia: quia quicquid est Pater quo Deus est, quo substantia est, quo æternitas est, hoc Filius, hoc Spiritus Sanctus. Ita etiam quicquid est Filius in eo quod Deus est, quo substantia est, quo æternitas est, hoc Pater, hoc Spiritus Sanctus. Et quicquid est Spiritus Sanctus in eo quod Deus est, quo substantia est, quo æternitas est, hoc Pater est et Filius. Una ergo in tribus Divinitas, una essentia, una omnipotentia, et quicquid substantialiter potest dici de Deo. Aug. de tempore, Serm. 38. [Alcuin. de Trin. lib. I. c. iii. p. 709.]

Neither hath this truth been affirmed by particular Fathers only, but decreed also in several councils, as by the first general council at [h] Constantinople, the second council at [i] Carthage, the fourth council at [k] Arles, the sixth at [l] Toledo, the [m] Lateran council, an. Dom. 649; yea, and by an ancient council here in [n] England held under archbishop Theodorus, about the year of our Lord 670. But the fourth council at Toledo speaks the substance of them all: [o] "According to the holy scriptures," say they, "and the doctrine which we have received from the holy Fathers, we confess the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be of one Divinity and substance, believing a Trinity in the diversity of persons, and preaching unity in the Divine nature, we neither confound the Persons nor separate the substances." And thus we conclude that *in the unity of the Godhead there be three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity,* Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

---

[h] *Περὶ τοῦ νόμου τῶν δυτικῶν· καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἀπεδεξάμεθα, τοὺς μίαν ὁμολογοῦντας πατρὸς, καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος θεότητα.* Concil. Constant. 1. cap. 5. [vol. I. p. 812.]

[i] Concil. Carthag. sec. c. 1.

[k] Concil. Arelat. 4. c. 1.

[l] Concil. Tolet. 6. c. 1.

[m] Concil. Lateran. c. 1.

[n] V. Bed. Histor. Angl. l. 4. c. 17. [p. 160.]

[o] Secundum enim divinas scripturas et doctrinam quam a sanctis patribus accepimus Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum unius Deitatis atque substantiæ confitemur, in personarum diversitate Trinitatem credentes, in Divinitate unitatem prædicantes nec personas confundimus nec substantias separamus. Concil. Tolet. 4. c. [1. vol. III. pp. 578, 9.]

ARTICLE II. A

OF THE WORD, OR SON OF GOD, WHICH WAS MADE VERY MAN.

The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and the Manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man.

IN the former article we have proved that there is but one God, and that this one God is three Persons, and every one of those three Persons is one God, and yet all but one God. In this we have the second Person, there spoken of, to be considered, called *the Son;* because begotten of the Father, not by spiritual regeneration, as other sons of God are, but by eternal generation, as none but himself is. The Son, who is the [a] Word of God, which expression is taken from those words, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,* John i. 1; which place being clearly to be understood of Christ, he is therefore called *the Word;* in Greek, *Logos,* a word, or speech; because, as a man utters his mind by the words of his mouth, so doth God reveal his will and effect his pleasure by his [b] Son. By the word of God were all things at the first made; he said, *Let there be light, and there was light: and God said, Let there be a firmament*, &c., *and there was so.* Hence the Apostle saith, *By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water*, 2 Pet. iii. 5; and, *the worlds were framed by the word of God*, Heb. xi. 3; and *the* Psalmist, *By the word of God were the heavens made; and all the hosts of them by the breath of his mouth*, Psalm xxxiii. 6. All which God is elsewhere said to do by his Son. *All things were made by him; and without him was nothing made that was made*, John i. 3: *the world was made by him*, ver. 10, *and by him* (speaking of Christ) *were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth*, &c.; *all things were created by him and for him.* Col. i. 16. And [c] therefore it is that the Son of God is called *the Word* of God; as also, because it was by him that he spake unto the Fathers, and gave them the promises; and because, as our words are the birth and effigies of our mind, so did Christ come from the Father, and is the express image and lively portraiture of him. And though John be the only person that gives him this title in the New Testament, yet he was not the first that gave it him; but is rather thought to have taken it out of the [d] Chaldee Para-

---

[a] Καὶ μή μοι γελοῖόν τις νομίσῃ τὸ υἱὸν εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ, οὐ γὰρ ὡς ποιηταὶ μυθοποιοῦσιν οὐδὲν βελτίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων δεικνῦντες τοὺς θεοὺς, ἢ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἢ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ πεφρονήκαμεν, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ. Athenag. leg. pro Christ. [10.]

[b] Pater meus usque modo operatur, operatus est pater lucem, sed dixit ut fieret lux, si dixit verbo operatus est, Verbum ejus ego (Christus) eram, ego sum, per me

---

factus est mundus, in illis operibus; per me regitur mundus in istis operibus, Aug. in Joh. tract. 17. [15. vol. III. par. ii. p. 429.] Neither is this the doctrine of the New Testament only, but of the Old also, where in the Chaldee Paraphrase (which the Jews had commonly read in their synagogues,) instead of אנכי עשיתי ארץ ואדם עליה בראתי, *I made the earth, and created man upon it*, is put אנא במימרי עבדית ארעא ואנשא עלה בריתי, *I by my word made the earth, and created man upon it.* Isa. xlv. 12. And so xlviii. 13. Jer. xxvii. 5: from which, and the like places, I suppose it is that Philo Judæus calls *λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the Word of God, *ὄργανον Θεοῦ δι᾽ οὗ (ὁ κόσμος) κατεσκεύασται*, Phil. de flammeo gladio. [vol. I. p. 162.] And elsewhere he saith, *Σκιὰ δὲ Θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ᾧ καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ προσχρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίει.* Id. Allegor. l. [III. vol. I. p. 106.]

[c] This seems to be the reason that Athenagoras gives why Christ is called *the Word of God*, when he saith, *ἀλλ᾽ ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ, πρὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ καὶ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο.* Athenag. leg. pro Christ. [loc. cit.]

[d] Where in the Hebrew text there is יהוה and אלהים in the Chaldee Paraphrase, מימרא דיי, *the Word of God*, is often put for it, and (which is observable) most usually where it is taken peculiarly for God the Son, as כי בכה ארוץ גדוד באלהי אדלג שור, *For by thee will I run through a troop; by my God will I leap over a wall.* 2 Sam. xxii. 30. For which the Targ. hath ארי במימרך אסגי משרין ובמימר אלהי אכבש כל כרכין תקיפין, *For by thy word I will mul-*

phrase of the Old Testament, which in our Saviour's time was much in use, where it frequently occurreth.

This *Son, who is the Word of the Father*, is said *to be begotten of the Father.* Here he is said to be *the Word of the Father*, and not the Word of *God;* because he cannot so properly be said to be begotten of God as of the Father. For here, as in the Trinity, we must have a great care how we speak concerning the Father's begetting of the Son, and the Son's being begotten of the Father; we may say, the Father begot the Son, and so he that was God begot him that was God; but we must not say God begot God. We may say one Divine person begot another; but we must not say one Divine nature begot another, for that would imply two Divine natures, one of which is begotten, the other not. But how may we properly say then, the Son is begotten of the Father? By receiving from the Father an unbegotten essence. His person must be begotten of the Father, otherwise he would not be his Son; but his essence must be unbegotten, otherwise he would not be God. And that Christ was begotten, and so begotten of the Father as to receive an unbegotten essence from him, is clear; but how the person of the Father, and not his essence, did beget; and how the person of the Son, and not his essence, was begotten, and so how the Son was begotten of the Father, is a mystery which

---

tiply tents, and by the word of God I will subdue all strong towers. So where we read ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלמו, *And God created man in his own image*, Gen. i. 27. the Hierus. Targum hath it, וברא מימרא דיי ית אדם בדמותיה, *And the Word of God created man in his likeness:* and again in the Heb. we read it, וישמעו את קול יהוה, *And they heard the voice of the Lord*, Gen. iii. 8, but in the Targ. of Onkelos it is rendered, ושמעו ית קל מימרא דיי, *And they heard the voice of the word of the Lord;* and to name no more, we read in the Heb. ישראל נושע ביהוה תשועת עולמים, *Israel shall be saved of the Lord with everlasting salvation.* Isa. xlv. 17: which being clearly spoken of the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, the Chaldee Paraphrase renders it expressly, ישראל יתפריק במימרא דיי פורקן עלמיא *Israel shall be saved, or redeemed, by the word of the Lord with an everlasting salvation*, or redemption. And hence I conceive it is that Philo the Jew calls his *δεύτερον* Θεὸν, *ὀρθὸν* Θεοῦ *λόγον καὶ πρωτόγονον υἱόν.* Phil. de Agricultura. And so Celsus also, in his dispute with Origen, speaking the sense of the Jews, acknowledged that Ὁ *Λόγος ἐστὶν υἱὸς τοῦ* Θεοῦ. Orig. contra Cels. l. 2. And as the Jews, before St. John, called *λόγον* Θεοῦ, *υἱὸν* Θεοῦ, St. John, after them, might well call *υἱὸν* Θεοῦ, *λόγον* Θεοῦ, and yet use no other than their own terms neither, that in their own translation of the Bible, and in other authors often occurred.

was never revealed to us. And therefore we are not to be too [e] curious to pry and search into it, especially seeing that it is beyond our capacities and abilities either to [f] express it aright to others, or to know and apprehend it aright in ourselves. All the apprehensions that we can frame of it, is only by conceiving the person of the Father to have [g] communicated his Divine essence to the person of the Son, and so of himself begetting his other self the Son, by communicating his own unbegotten essence to him. I say, by communicating of his *essence*, not of his *person*, for then they would be both the same person, as now they have both the same essence. The essence of the Father did not beget the Son by communicating his person to him, but the person of the Father begat the Son by communicating his essence to him: so that the person of the Son is begotten, not communicated; but the essence of the Son is communicated, not begotten.

---

[e] Quomodo sane Deus Pater genuerit Filium nolo discutias, nec te curiosius inseras in profundi hujus Arcanum, ne forte dum inaccessæ Lucis fulgorem pertinacius perscrutaris, exiguum ipsum qui mortalibus divino munere concessus est perdas aspectum. Ruffin. in exp. Symbol. [p. 18.] Credendus est ergo Deus Pater esse unici Filii Domini nostri, non discutiendus; neque enim fas est servo de natalibus Domini disputare. Ibid. And St. Basil excellently, *Χριστοῦ γέννησις, ἡ μὲν οἰκεία καὶ πρώτη καὶ ἰδία αὐτοῦ τῆς θεότητος, σιωπῇ τιμάσθω· μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἐννοίαις ἡμῶν μὴ ζητεῖν ἐκεῖνα μηδὲ πολυπραγμονεῖν ἐπιτάξωμεν. ὅπου γὰρ οὐ χρόνος οὐκ αἰὼν ἐμεσίτευσεν, οὐ τρόπος ἐπινενόηται, οὐ θεατὴς παρῆν, οὐχ ὁ διηγούμενός ἐστι πῶς φαντασθῇ ὁ νοῦς; πῶς δὲ ὑπηρετήσει ταῖς διανοίαις ἡ γλῶσσα; ἀλλὰ πατὴρ ἦν, καὶ υἱὸς ἐγεννήθη· μὴ εἴπῃς, πότε; ἀλλὰ παράδραμε τὸ ἐπερώτημα. μὴ ἐπιζητήσῃς, πῶς; ἀδύνατος γὰρ ἡ ἀπόκρισις.* Basil. hom. 25. de huma. Christi generat. [vol. I. p. 504. init.]

[f] *Ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐπειδὰν οὐχ ἵστησί σου τὴν πολυπραγμοσύνην τῶν λογισμῶν ὁ τοιοῦτος λόγος τῆς ἀποκρίσεως; ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρρητον καταφεύγω τῆς δόξης καὶ ὁμολογῶ ἀνεπινόητον εἶναι λογισμοῖς καὶ ἄβατον ῥήμασιν ἀνθρωπίνοις τὸν τρόπον τῆς θείας γεννήσεως, Ibid.* [init.] *Καταλίπωμεν οὖν τοὺς λόγους τοὺς περὶ τῆς ἀϊδίου ἐκείνης καὶ ἀρρήτου γεννήσεως. ἐκεῖνο ἐνθυμηθέντες, ὅτι ὁ μὲν νοῦς τῶν πραγμάτων ἐλάττων, ὁ δὲ λόγος τῶν νοουμένων πάλιν καταδεέστερος.* Ibid. [init.] Si quis itaque nobis dixerit, quomodo ergo Filius prolatus a Patre est? Dicimus ei, quia prolationem istam sive generationem, sive nuncupationem, sive adapertionem, aut quomodolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem nemo novit; non hæretici omnes, neque angeli, neque archangeli, nec principes, neque potestates, nisi solus qui generavit, Pater, et qui natus est, Filius. Iren. l. [II. c. xxviii. 6. p. 158.] adv. Hæres. And therefore Athanasius propounding the question *πῶς ὁ υἱὸς καὶ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ γεννᾶται ἐκ πατρὸς*, begins his answer thus: *Ἐπεὶ ὁ θεὸς ἀθεώρητός ἐστι, καὶ ἀνερμηνευτὸς, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἑρμηνεῦσαι δυνάμεθα· πῶς γάρ τις ἑρμηνεῦσαι δύναται ὃ οὐδέπω αὐτὸς ἐθεάσατο ἢ παρ' ἄλλων ἀκήκοε πώποτε;* Athanas. quæst. al. quæst. 14. [tom. II. pp. 339, 40.]

[g] Sed incomprehensibiliter, inenarrabiliter, ante omne tempus et secula, unigenitum ex his quæ ingenita in se erant procreavit (pater,) omne quod Deus est, per caritatem atque virtutem nativitati ejus impertiens, ac sic ab ingenito, perfecto, æternoque Patre, unigenitus, et perfectus, et æternus est Filius. Hilar. de Trinit. l. 3. [3.]

And this communication of the Divine essence of the Father to the Divine person of the Son was *from everlasting*, as the essence itself was. For eternity is an essential property, yea, the very essence of God itself: and therefore the essence being, its eternity could not but be communicated to the Son; from whence he must of necessity be begotten of the Father from everlasting. So that as the essence of the Father that was communicated to the Son, had not, so neither had the person of the Son, whose essence was so communicated from the Father, any beginning; but as the essence communicated was, so was the communication of that essence to the Son, from all eternity.

Hence also it is here said, that the *Son is very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father:* that is, of one essence or nature with the Father. For his essence, as we have heard, is the selfsame individual essence that the Father's is, communicated from the Father to him, the same eternal, almighty, all-wise, infinite, unbegotten, uncreated essence: and therefore he is not another, but the same *very and eternal God.* And so there is no difference, no nor distinction at all betwixt the Father and the Son in their essential, but only in their personal properties. The Son is of the same substance and essence with the Father, but herein they differ, that [h] the Father hath his essence of himself, the Son of the Father; and so the person of the Father is not from the person of the Son, but from himself; whereas the person of the Son is not from himself, but from the person of the Father. But his person is so begotten of the Father as to be the same in essence with him, *very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father.*

---

[h] Pater est Deus, de quo Filius est Deus, de quo autem Pater nullus est Deus, Aug. [vol. II. ep. clxx. 7.] ad Maximum. And again, upon those words, *I know him, for I am of him,* the same Father observes, "Ab ipso, inquit, sum, quia Filius de Patre est; et quicquid est Filius, de illo est cujus est Filius; ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus de Deo; Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo, sed tantum Deum; et dicimus Dominum Jesum Lumen de Lumine, Patrem non dicimus Lumen de Lumine, sed tantum Lumen. Id. [vol. III. par. ii.] in Joh. Tract. 31. [4.] Pater vita est non nascendo, Filius vita nascendo. Pater de nullo Patre, Filius de Deo Patre. Pater quod est a nullo est; quod autem Pater est propter filium est; Filius vero, et quod Filius est propter Patrem est, et quod est a Patre est. Id. Tract. 19. [13.] Manet ergo Pater vita manet et Filius vita. Pater vita in semetipso non a Filio, Filius vita in semetipso

This Son of God, a distinct Person, but the same in substance with the Father, being the middle person betwixt the Father and the Spirit, undertakes to be Mediator betwixt God and man; by him the world was made, and by him therefore it was fitting it should be redeemed; which notwithstanding could not have been done by him, unless he became the Son of man in time, as well as he had been the Son of God from eternity. Hereupon he took man's nature; he that had the nature of God communicated to him, hath the nature of man assumed by him. Not as if the Divine nature was converted into or confounded with the human, but only the human nature is assumed into the Divine, so as to become perfectly man like unto us in all things, our sinful infirmities only excepted, in time, as he had been perfectly God, like to the Father in all things, his personal properties only excepted, from eternity. And therefore man having two

---

sed a Patre." *Ibid.* And upon this account it is that our Saviour saith, *Ὁ Πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστὶ*, John xiv. 28, as the Fathers generally expound it; as Athanasius, *Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ εἴρηκεν ὁ Πατήρ μου κρείττων ἐστὶν, ἵνα μὴ ξένον τῆς ἐκείνου φύσεως αὐτὸν (τὶς) ὑπολάβοι, ἀλλὰ μείζων εἶπεν, οὐ μεγέθει τινὶ, οὐδὲ χρόνῳ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς γέννησιν.* Contra Arrian. [orat. I. 58.]; and St. Chrysostome, *Εἰ δὲ λέγοι τὶς μείζονα εἶναι τὸν Πατέρα καθὸ αἴτιος τοῦ υἱοῦ οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀντεροῦμεν*, in Joh. hom. 75. [tom. II. p. 869.] So Damascen saith some things are spoken of Christ, *ὧς ἐξ αἰτίου τοῦ Πατρὸς*, to shew that the Father is the cause of him, *ὡς τὸ, ὁ Πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστὶν, ἐξ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔχει τό τε εἶναι καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἔχει.* Orthod. Fid. l. 4. c. 19. [init.] And St. Basil clearly, *Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ ἀρχὴ τῷ υἱῷ, κατὰ τοῦτο μείζων ὁ πατὴρ, ὧς αἴτιος καὶ ἀρχή. διὸ καὶ ὁ κύριος εἶπεν, ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστὶ καθὸ πατὴρ δηλονότι.* Contra Eunom. l. 1. [p. 724.] And St. Hilary, Major itaque Pater Filio est; et plane major, cui tantum donat esse quantus ipse est. De Trinit. l. 9. [54.] And Gregory Nazianzen, *Δῆλον ὅτι τὸ μεῖζόν ἐστι τῆς αἰτίας.* De Theolog. orat. 4. [vol. I. p. 582. A.] And so others; but St. Augustine expounds it of his incarnation, that as he was man his Father was greater than he: Quid itaque mirum, vel quid indignum, si secundum hanc formam servi loquens, ait Dei Filius, Pater major me est; et secundum Dei formam loquens, ait idem ipse Dei Filius, Ego et Pater unum sumus? Unum enim sunt secundum id quod Deus erat Verbum, et major est Pater secundum id quod verbum caro factum est. Aug. [vol. III. par. ii.] in Joh. tract. lxxviii. [2.] V. Nicet. p. 233.

essential constitutive parts, a soul and a body, Christ in his assuming of the human nature was invested with both[i], yea, and the natural infirmities of both too; he had a soul as well as we, he had a body as well as we, and he had his soul and body united together as well as we, and so was hungry and thirsty and weary and sorrowful, as we are.

[k] *This human nature he took in the Virgin's womb of her substance.* As he was God, he had no mother; as he was man, he had no father: as God, he had his Divine nature from his Father; as man, he had his human nature from his mother, whose womb was as the bridechamber wherein the marriage knot betwixt the two natures was tied, never to be divided. Neither did he only take the human nature in the Virgin's womb, but of her substance, so that his human nature was as really of the same substance with his mother Mary, as his Divine nature was of the same substance with his Father God. And as he was begotten of his Father without a mother from eternity, so was he born of his mother without a father in time. His mother being a virgin after he was born, as really as she was a virgin before he was conceived. I say, before he was conceived; for though he was not begotten of the Virgin by man, yet he was conceived in her by God, even by God the Holy Ghost miraculously overshadowing her. The manner of which conception is as difficult to be understood by men, as the truth of it is evidently avouched by God. Only this we know, that he was not so conceived

---

[i] *Ὁλὸν ὅλῃ συνηνῶσθαι φαμὲν τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀνθρωπότητι τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ λόγον· οὐ γάρ που τὸ ἄμεινον ἐν ἡμῖν, τουτέστι τὴν ψυχὴν, οὐδενὸς ἂν ἠξίωσε λόγου μόνῃ δωρούμενος τῇ σαρκὶ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοὺς πόνους, ἐπράττετο δὲ καλῶς δι' ἄμφω τῆς οἰκονομίας τὸ μυστήριον· προσεχρήσατο δὲ καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ τῇ μὲν ἰδίᾳ σαρκὶ πρὸς τὰ σαρκὸς ἔργα τε καὶ ἀρρωστήματα φυσικὰ καὶ ὅσα μώμου μακρὰν, ψυχῇ δὲ αὖ τῇ ἰδίᾳ πρὸς τὰ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ ἀνυπαίτια πάθη.* Cyrill. Alex. de rect. fide ad Theodos. [vol. V. par. ii. p. 18.]

[k] Sicut nondum natus ex Virgine Patrem Deum habere potuit sine homine (Matre) æque cum de Virgine nasceretur potuit matrem habere (Hominem) sine Homine Patre, Tertullian. de Carne Christi: [cap. xviii.] Ipse enim Pater Deus et origo et principium rerum quoniam parentibus caret *ἀπάτωρ* atque *ἀμήτωρ* a Trismegisto verissime nominatur, quod ex nullo sit procreatus. Idcirco etiam Filium bis nasci oportuit, ut ipse fieret *ἀπάτωρ* atque *ἀμήτωρ*. In prima enim nativitate spiritali *ἀμήτωρ* fuit, quia sine officio matris a solo Patre generatus est. In secunda vero carnali *ἀπάτωρ* fuit, quoniam sine patris officio virginali utero procreatus est. Lactant. de vera sapient. cap. 13. [init.]

by the Spirit as to have the Spirit for his father, as he had the Virgin for his mother; for though he was conceived by the Spirit, yet it is not said he was begotten of the Spirit: and therefore the Spirit cannot be said to be father to him, generation being the ground of paternal relation. But only he was so conceived by the Spirit of God as not to need to be begotten by man.

Lastly, He so took the nature of man, as *that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and the manhood, were joined together in one Person, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man.* So that as in the Trinity there be three Persons and yet but one nature, so here there be two natures and yet but one Person: so that the two natures do not either of them constitute a distinct Person, but both of them make up one and the same Person. And therefore we must consider how the human nature had no subsistence in itself, by which it could be a distinct Person of itself, but its subsistence was only in the Divine Person: and also how as it was not a human person, but the human nature that was assumed, so it was not the Divine nature, but a Divine Person that did assume: and therefore this Divine Person, though he hath received one nature from his Father, and another from his mother, yet receiving them both into the [1] unity of his Person, though he hath two absolutely distinct natures, yet he is but one and the same Person, *very God* by his Divine, and *very man* by his human nature; which two natures being thus once united together, they can never be put asunder; but as Christ was God and not man from eternity, he will now be both God and man to eternity.

And for the truth of all this we shall first consult the scriptures. And here we have several things to be confirmed. 1. That the Son was *begotten from everlasting of the*

---

[1] Confitemur unigenitum Dei Filium in his omnibus in quibus Deus Pater existit, una cum patre æternaliter subsistentem partes nostræ naturæ simul unitas, ex quibus verus Deus in se existens fieret verus homo, humanum viz. corpus passibile et animam intellectivam seu rationalem ipsum corpus vere per se et essentialiter informantem assumpsisse ex tempore in virginali thalamo ad unitatem suæ hypostasis et personæ. Concil. Vien. de Sum. Trinit. et Fid. Cathol. [Hard. Conc. vol. VII. p. 1359.]

Father. 2. That *he is very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father.* 3. *He took man's nature upon him in the womb of the Virgin.* 4. He so took man's nature upon him, that he is but one and the same Person, having both these natures united together in himself.

First, that "the Son was begotten from everlasting of the Father." And truly this the Father himself, who best knows the Son himself begets, assures us of, saying of this Jesus Christ we are speaking of, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*, Matt. iii. 17. And, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, Psalm ii. 7. Heb. i. 5. Hence he is called *the Son of the living God*, Matt. xvi. 16: yea, *the only begotten of the Father,* John i. 14. And that he was begotten from everlasting is as certain as that he was begotten at all of the Father: for it is expressly said by Christ, [m] *The Lord*

---

[m] What we here translate *the Lord possessed me,* the LXX. render Κύριος ἔκτισέ με, and this being the translation which the Greek church generally received, the Arians and Eunomians, and other heretics, took occasion to urge this place against the eternity and divinity of the Son. Yea, as it is in Athanasius, Τοῦτο δὲ ὅμως αὐτοὶ τὸ ῥητὸν ἄνω καὶ κάτω περιφέροντες ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων τὸν υἱὸν εἶναι ἔλεγον. Athan. in Nic. syn. cont. hær. Ar. decr. [13. vol. I. p. 219.] Yea, Arius himself, in his dispute with Athanasius, insisteth much upon it. Yea, and Eunomius makes use of it too in St. Basil, and that translation being generally received by the orthodox themselves, as well as heretics, the Fathers were put hard to it to find out a full answer to the objection, and after other evasions of it were still forced at length to refer the words to the human nature, for fear lest they should understand them of his Divine nature, they should be forced to acknowledge him a creature indeed: ληπτέον οὖν, saith St. Basil, τὸ μὲν ἐγέννησεν ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἔκτισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ τὴν μορφὴν τοῦ δούλου λαβόντος: adv. Eunom. l. 4. [vol. I. p. 774.] And Athanasius, Καὶ γὰρ λέγων τὸ, ἔκτισε, τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σημαίνει, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος γέγονε καὶ ἐκτίσθη. Epist. [II.] ad Serap. [vol. I. par. ii. p. 690.] But if they had but consulted the original, (which in those days was too much neglected and but little understood,) they would have found it there expressed in far different terms, יהוה קנני *the Lord possessed me*, as the word always signifies; not Κύριος ἔκτισέ με, for the word is not so much as once taken in that sense. And St. Basil himself observes also in one place against Eunomius, that some ancient interpreters did render the word, not ἔκτισέ με, but ἐκτήσατό με, as ours hath it. Τεώς γε μὴν, saith he, μηδὲ ἐκεῖνο ἀπαρασήμαντον καταλίπωμεν, ὅτι ἄλλοι τῶν ἑρμηνέων οἱ καιριώτερον τῆς σημασίας τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν καθικόμενοι ἐκτήσατό με ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔκτισεν ἐκδεδώκασιν. Adv. Eun. l. 2. [p. 735.] And then it follows, ὅπερ μέγιστον αὐτοῖς ἐμπόδιον ἔσται πρὸς τὴν βλασφημίαν τοῦ κτίσματος· ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχὶ κτίσας τὸν Καΐν ἀλλὰ γεννήσας ταύτῃ φαίνεται χρησάμενος τῇ φωνῇ. Ibid. By which means this place is so far from making against the divinity of Christ, that it maketh altogether for it, proving that for which I cited it, even that he was begotten from eternity, ἐκτήσατό με being the same with ἐγέννησέ με.

possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths I was brought forth, when there were no fountains abounding with water, before the mountains were settled: before the hills was I brought forth. Prov. viii. 22—25. And he that was brought forth before time must needs be begotten from eternity. Thus it is said also, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,* John i. 1. Where we may see, that in the beginning, before the world was, the Word was; yea, it was by the Word that the world was created, ver. 3, which could not be unless himself was before it: and before the world was, there was nothing but eternity. And therefore if he be before the world, he must needs have been from eternity.

But what ground have we in scripture to say, The Son was begotten of the Father by receiving an unbegotten essence from him? or that the Father's begetting of the Son was by communicating his own essence to him?

Why, this notion I ground upon those words, *For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he* [n] *given to the Son to have life in himself,* John v. 26.[o] *To have life in himself* is an essential property of the Divine nature: and therefore wheresoever that is given or communicated, the nature itself must needs be given and communicated. Now here we see God the Father communicated this his essential property, and so his own essence, to the Son; and by consequence, though he be a distinct person from him, yet he hath the same unbegotten essence with him, and so, *as the Father hath life in himself, so hath the Son life in himself*, and so all the other properties of the Divine essence, only with this personal distinction, the Father hath this *having life in himself*, not from the Son but from himself; whereas the Son hath this *having life in himself*, not from himself but from the Father.

---

[n] The Father being here said to have given to the Son *to have life in himself,* he is therefore by the ancients called *causa, principium, origo, fons, radix Filii et Deitatis;* as Athanasius, Ὥστε μὲν αἴτιός ἐστι μόνος ὁ Πατὴρ, τὰ δὲ αἰτιατὰ δύο, ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα· αἴτιος δὲ λέγεται ὁ Πατὴρ διότι γεννᾷ καὶ οὐ γεννᾶται, ἐκπορεύει καὶ οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται, γεννᾷ μὲν τὸν υἱὸν ἐκπορεύει δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται ὁ πατὴρ αἴτιος. Athanas. quæst. al. 11. [vol. II. p. 339.] Pater principium, non de principio, Filius principium de principio, Aug. [vol. VIII. p. 716.] contra Maxim. l. II. cap. 17. [4.] Ἀρχὴ μὲν οὖν πατρὸς οὐδεμία, ἀρχὴ δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁ πατὴρ, Basil. contra Eunom. l. 2. [vol. I. p. 735.] Ἀδικήσει δὲ ὅλως οὐδὲν τὸ ὡς ἐν πηγῇ τῷ πατρὶ τὸν υἱὸν ὑπάρχειν ἐννοεῖν· μόνον γὰρ τὸ ἐξ οὗ τὸ τῆς πηγῆς ἐν τούτοις ὄνομα σημαίνει. Cyril. Alex. in Joh. 1. [vol. IV. p. 12.] In the Florentine Council many of these titles were put together; μίαν γινώσκομεν τὸν πατέρα αἰτίαν καὶ ῥίζαν, καὶ πηγὴν τῆς θεότητος, Ses. 25. [Hard. Conc. IX. p. 379.] Yea, and he is called the Head too, as St. Cyril of Alexandria, Κεφαλὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ Θεὸς ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν, Ad Regin. Ep. 1. [vol. V. par. ii. de recta fide, p. 64.] all plainly intimating, that the whole Divinity both of the Son and Spirit was communicated from the Father. Fons ergo et origo totius divinitatis ipse est. Concil. Tolet. XI. [vol. III. p. 1020.]

[o] Though the Father be here said to give to the Son to have *life in himself,* yet seeing it is here said he *hath life in himself* as well as the Father, hence it is that as the ancients asserted the Son to have received his Divine essence from the Father, so they asserted also that he hath it wholly and perfectly in himself, and therefore do they call him Αὐτοζωὴν, as Ἀνάγκη πᾶσα τῆς ἁπλότητος ὁμολογουμένης αὐτοζώην εἶναι

Secondly, that this *Son of God is very and eternal God* may be proved from what hath been said concerning the

---

τὸν λόγον οἴεσθαι· οὐ ζωῆς μετουσίαν, Greg. Nyssen. in Catech. Maj. [vol. III. p. 46.] *Ὅτι κοινὴ πρόληψις πᾶσιν ὁμοίως Χριστιανοῖς ἐνυπάρχει (τοῖς γε ὡς ἀληθῶς τῆς προσηγορίας ταύτης ἀξίοις) περὶ τοῦ φῶς εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν, γεννητὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου φωτὸς ἀπολαμψάντα, καὶ αὐτοζωὴν, καὶ αὐτοάγαθον ἐκ τῆς ζωοποιοῦ πηγῆς, τῆς πατρικῆς ἀγαθότητος προελθόντα.* Basil. advers. Eunomium, l. 2. [vol. I. p. 740.]; clearly intimating, that though he had his Divine life and nature from the Father, as the fountain of Deity, yet he received it not by participation, but by communication; he did not only participate of it, but it was wholly communicated unto him. And therefore it is also, that though Athanasius saith in one place, Christ is *ἐκ Θεοῦ Θεὸς, ἐκ σοφοῦ σοφὸς, καὶ ἐκ λογικοῦ Λόγος, καὶ ἐκ Πατρὸς υἱὸς*, contra Arrian. Orat. 5. init. [vol. I. p. 618.] yet in another place he saith, *Αὐτοσοφία, αὐτολόγος, αὐτοδύναμις, ἰδία τοῦ Πατρός ἐστιν, αὐτοφῶς, αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, αὐτοαρετὴ*, contra Gentes, Orat. fin. [vol. I. p. 46.]: that is, as I suppose, *ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχων τὴν σοφίαν, τὴν ζωὴν, τὴν δύναμιν*, &c. which supposition is both consonant to this place of scripture, where he is said, *ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχειν τὴν ζωὴν*, and also to the Father himself, who in this seems to be his own interpreter; for before he tells us how Christ is thus *αὐτοσοφία, αὐτοδύναμις*, &c. he first tells how he is not, saying, *Καὶ ὅτι ἀγαθὸν ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ γέννημα, καὶ ἀληθινὸς υἱὸς ὑπάρχων δυναμίς ἐστι τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ σοφία, καὶ Λόγος, οὐ κατὰ μετοχὴν ταῦτα ὢν, οὐδὲ ἔξωθεν ἐπιγινομένων τούτων αὐτῷ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ μετέχοντας, καὶ σοφιζομένους δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ δυνατοὺς, καὶ λογικοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένους, ἀλλ' αὐτοσοφία*, &c. where he shews, that they that participate of strength and wisdom from God, are *δυνατοὶ, καὶ λογικοὶ ἐν αὐτῷ*, viz. *Θεῷ·* but Christ is not so, he is not *ἐν αὐτῷ σοφὸς καὶ δυνατὸς*, but *αὐτοσοφία καὶ αὐτοδύναμις*, or not *ἐν αὐτῷ σοφὸς καὶ δυνατὸς*, but *ἐν ἑαυτῷ σοφία καὶ δυναμίς*. And this is the purport of the like expressions in other of the Fathers, as Theodoret calls him, *Αὐτοδύναμιν, καὶ αὐτοζωὴν, καὶ αὐτοσοφίαν*, contra Anathem. quart. Cyrilli. [vol. IV. p. 712.] Eusebius, *Αὐτονοῦν, καὶ αὐτολόγον, καὶ αὐτοσοφίαν, καὶ εἴ τι δὲ αὐτοκαλὸν, καὶ αὐτοαγαθὸν*, Evang. demonst. l. 4. c. 12. Origen, *Αὐτολόγον, καὶ αὐτοσοφίαν, καὶ αὐτοαλήθειαν, καὶ αὐτοδικαιοσύνην.* Contra Cels. l. 3. [41. vol. I. p. 474.] And so Chrysostome terms him, *Αὐτοαθανασίαν, αὐτομακαριότητα.* And Dacommunication of the Divine essence from the Father to him: for if he hath the same nature that the Father hath, he cannot but be the same God that the Father is. And the same would further appear, if we considered how the names, properties, works, and worship, which is given to the Father, is given to the Son too. The Father is called *Jehovah*, and so is the Son, Isa. iv. 3. Hos. i. 7. The Father vi. is called *God*, so is the Son, John i. 1: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* With God as to his person, God himself as to his essence; so John xx. 28. Acts x. 28. 1 Tim. iii. 16, &c. The Father is Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, Isaiah xli. 4. xliv. 6, so is the Son, Rev. i. 8, 17. Is the Father eternal? so is the Son, Isa. ix. 6. Apoc. i. 8. Is the Father almighty? so is the Son, Heb. i. 3. Is the Father every-

---

mascen calls the whole Trinity, and so every Person, Αὐτοφῶς, *αὐταγαθότητα, αὐτοζωὴν, αὐτοουσίαν,* de orth. fid. l. 1. c. 8. [p. 24.] where he also explains himself what he means by *αὐτὸς* in that composition, adding after *αὐτοουσίαν, ὡς μὴ παρ' ἑτέρου τὸ εἶναι ἔχουσαν.* All which, and the like expressions amongst the Fathers, Epiphanius seems to me most clearly to explain, saying, Ὁ Θεὸς *λόγος ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχων τὴν πᾶσαν τελειότητα αὐτοτέλειος ὢν, αὐτόθεος ὢν, αὐτοδύναμις, αὐτονοῦς, αὐτοφῶς,* Hæres. 77. [vol. I. p. 1029.] plainly shewing, that *αὐτοτέλειος, αὐτοδύναμις, αὐτόθεος,* is the same with *ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ πᾶσαν τελειότητα, δύναμιν, θεότητα.* For though Christ hath not these perfections *ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ*, yet he hath them *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*; though he be Θεὸς *ἐκ* Θεοῦ, yet he is Θεὸς *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*, and that is sufficient to denominate him Αὐτόθεος. Neither is Epiphanius the only person that calleth him so; but it is said also in Eusebius [III. p. 223.], *ὥστε μόνον τῶν ἐξ αἰῶνος* Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν *τὸν ἡμῶν σωτῆρα καὶ πρὸς αὐτῶν τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀνωτάτω, οὐχ οἷα κοινὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων βασιλέα γενόμενον ὁμολογεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' οἷα τοῦ καθόλου* Θεοῦ *παῖδα γνήσιον καὶ αὐτόθεον προσκυνεῖσθαι.* Hist. l. 10. c. 4. In which and the like places, Αὐτόθεος is not to be understood *ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ* Θεὸς, but *ἐν ἑαυτῷ* Θεός; or, which is the same, *αὐτὸς ὁ* Θεὸς, one who is God in himself, and so God himself. For though he had his Deity from the Father, yet he so had it from him, as to have it in himself; so that though he hath his Divine nature from the Father, yet he hath it in himself as well as the Father. And therefore saith St. Augustine, Sicut habet Pater vitam in semetipso, sic dedit et Filio vitam habere in semetipso, ut hoc solum intersit inter Patrem et Filium, quod Pater habet vitam in semetipso quam nemo ei dedit, Filius autem habet vitam in semetipso quam Pater dedit: in Joh. Tract. 19. [11. vol. III. par. ii.] And hence it is, that in the begetting of the Son, the Father communicated his whole essence to him; so as to give the Son to be in himself whatsoever himself as God was in himself; so that, as St. Augustine expresseth it, Genuit de se alterum se: ad Maxim. [vol. II. epist. CLXX. 5.] And therefore also doth Anastasius Sinaita call the Son Δευ*τέρωσιν ὑποστάσεως ἐν ταυτότητι φύσεως*, Anast. Sin. *ἐν ὁδηγῷ.*

where? so is the Son, Matt. xviii. 20. Doth the Father know all things? so doth the Son, John xxi. 17. Did the Father make all things? so did the Son, John i. 3. Doth the Father preserve and uphold all things? so doth the Son, Heb. i. 3. Doth the Father forgive sins? so doth the Son, Matt. ix. 6. Is the Father to be worshipped? so is the Son, Heb. i. 6. Is the Father to be honoured? so is the Son, John v. 23. No wonder then, if Christ, *being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, Phil. ii. 6: he did not think he robbed God of any glory by saying himself was equal to him. And thus the second thing is clear, that *Christ is very and eternal God.*

Thirdly, this Son of God became very man, so that he was not more like to God, yea, very God in his Divine, than he was like to man, yea, very man in his human nature; and as he was begotten of the same substance with God the Father from eternity, so was he conceived of the same substance with us men in time; and therefore is there nothing that belongs to us as men but what he took upon himself. Have we a body? so had he, Heb. x. 5, 10. Have we flesh and blood? so had he, Heb. ii. 14. Have we hands and feet? so had he, Luke xxiv. 39. Have we a soul? so had he, Matt. xxvi. 38. Are we hungered? so was he, Matt. iv. 2: and weary? so was he, John iv. 6: and heavy and sorrowful? so was he, Mark xiv. 33. Do we grow in stature and knowledge? so did he, Luke ii. 52. Do we die? so did he, he gave up the ghost too, John xix. 30. Thus was he in all things tempted like us, but only in sin, Heb. ii. 17. iv. 15. So well may he be called *the man Christ Jesus*, 1 Tim. ii. 5. 1 Cor. xv. 21. and *Christ Jesus the Son of man*, Matt. xxvi. 2.

Fourthly, We have seen how express the scripture is in asserting him to be both God and man; now we are to inquire, whether he be thus God and man in one Person or in two. I mean, whether he be God in one Person and man in another, or both God and man in the same Person. But we need not make much inquiry after it, the scripture being so plain and frequent in attributing to him two natures and yet but one Person; in saying, that *the Word was made flesh*, John i. 14. He did not take flesh unto him, but into him;

yea, he was *made flesh;* that is, he that was as really a spirit as God, became as really flesh as man; not by [p] changing himself into flesh, but by taking flesh into himself, to make up one and the same Person with himself. Hence the same Person who was *in the form of God* is said to have taken upon him *the form of a servant*, Phil. ii. 6, 7. Hence also is the Son of God said to be born of the Virgin Mary, Luke i. 35, which could not be unless the Son of God and the Son of Mary was the same person. Hence it is also that we are said to have but one Mediator, 1 Tim. ii. 5; that is, though our Mediator have two natures, yet being but one Person he is but one Mediator. And, to name no more, hence it is that God is said to have purchased his Church with his own blood, Acts xx. 28. With the blood of the Divine nature? No, for that hath no blood. With the blood of man, a distinct person from God? No, for then it could not be called God's own blood. And therefore it cannot possibly be otherwise interpreted than to signify the blood of a Person who was God as well as man; who being God, and becoming man, and purchasing his Church with that blood himself assumed with the human nature, may justly be said to have purchased his Church with his own blood. And hence it is, that to denote his two natures in one Person he hath a name given him where they are both joined in one word, *Immanuel*, Isa. vii. 14. which is truly interpreted *God with us*, Matt. i. 23. In the beginning of the word *Immenu*, *with us*, there is the human, at the end *El*, *God*, there is the Divine nature implied, and both in the same word, to shew that though they be two natures, yet one name or word is sufficient to express them both, they both making up but the same Person. And thus we see how evidently it hath pleased the most high God to unveil this great mystery to us, clearly discovering, not only that Christ was begotten of himself, and so very God from eternity; and that he was born of a woman, and so very man in time; but also that he was and is both very God and very man in the very selfsame Person.

---

[p] *Μηδὲ φαντασθῇς ἠλλοιῶσθαι τὴν θεότητα μεταβληθεῖσαν εἰς σάρκα.* Basil. de humana Christi generatione, [vol. I. p. 506.] *οὐκ ἄλλος γέγονε τὴν σάρκα λαβὼν, ἀλλ' ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν ἐκαλύπτετο ταύτῃ.* Athan. cont. Arr. orat. [II. 8. vol. I. p. 476.] *οὕτω γὰρ ἔστι μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, Θεὸς ὢν καὶ ἄνθρωπος γεγονὼς, οὐ τραπεὶς τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑκάτερα πρὸς τὰ ἀμφότερα μεσιτεύων.* Epiph. in Anchor. [xliv.] And there are many the like expressions to be met with in the Fathers, intimating that his Divine nature was not changed into the human, but only the human taken into the Divine: he did not lay aside the one to assume the other, but he assumed one to the other, so that he was as perfectly both God and man after, as he was God and not man before his incarnation. Semetipsum exinanivit, saith St. Augustine, formam servi accipiens: non ergo formam Dei amittens. Factus est ergo homo qui erat Deus, accipiendo quod non erat, non amittendo quod erat. [Vol. III. par. ii.] in Joh. Tract. 23. [6.] Semetipsum autem exinanivit formam servi accipiens: non ergo amittens illam sed accipiens istam. Eo modo se exinaniens quo hic minor apparebat, qui apud Patrem manebat. Forma quippe servi accessit non forma Dei recessit. Hæc est assumpta non illa consumpta. Ibid. Tract. 78. [1.] Erat enim humanæ naturæ proprietas; sed non Dei forma jam non erat, quia per ejus exinanitionem servi erat forma suscepta. Neque enim defecerit natura ne esset; sed in se humilitatem terrenæ nativitatis manens sibi Dei natura susceperat. Hilar. de Trin. l. 9. [51.] Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura. Et sicut formam servi Dei forma non adimit, sic formam Dei servi forma non minuit. Leo. epist. ad Flavian. [p. 150, 1.]

And what scripture affirms, reason cannot but subscribe to: as, first, that the Son was begotten of the Father is plain, otherwise he would not be a [q] Son, nor the other a Father. Secondly, that he was begotten from everlasting is plain, otherwise he would not be God; God, as I have shewn, being everlasting, both from and to eternity. But, thirdly, that Jesus Christ is God, very God, is as plain as either of the former. For as he could not be called a Son unless he were begotten, so he could not be called Jesus unless he were very God. For he cannot be called Jesus unless he brings salvation unto men; but it is impossible for him to bring salvation unto men unless himself be God. For wherein consists the salvation which this Jesus was to procure for us, but in bearing those punishments which were due from God to us, and in performing that obedience which is due from us to God? Now it is impossible for one that is not God to do these things for us.

To unveil this mystery and the reason thereof more clearly, we must consider that there be two things wherein man standeth indebted unto God: first, he owes him obedience to his precepts; secondly, satisfaction to his justice for his disobedience. The first is the principal debt, the other accessory, proceeding from the forfeiture, as it were, of the bond and breach of the covenant, wherein man was obliged to the payment of the former. But man in Adam proving bankrupt became non-solvent, unable to pay either; and therefore, unless there be some person found out that is willing to undertake, and is able to perform, the office of suretyship in paying of both these debts for him, he can expect no other than to be cast into prison, and not to come out thence till he hath paid the uttermost farthing, which himself can never do. The principal debt of obedience he can never pay, because he is become a sinner, one whose actions are all rebellion and disobedience: the accessory he can never pay, it being impossible for a finite creature to make complete satisfaction to infinite justice.

---

[q] Etenim si Filius est, natus est; si natus est, ab illo est de quo natus est. Aug. [vol. III. p. ii.] in Joh. Tract. 20. [8.] Sed non est de se Filius. Si de se esset, Filius non esset; Ibid. Tract. 22. [14.] Pater autem non est, si non habet Filium, et Filius non est, si non habet Patrem. Ibid. Tract. 29. [5.]

And as man himself cannot, so neither can any person who is any way inferior unto God pay these debts for him. First, None but one that is equal to God can perform obedience for man; because every one that is any way inferior unto God depends continually upon him, and therefore is bound to do whatsoever it can do for God upon its own account; it being impossible for a creature to perform more to God than itself is bound to do. And every creature being bound to do for itself whatsoever itself can do for God, no creature, that is, no person any way inferior to God himself in his essence, can perform obedience for any other persons but itself. Whereas we must have one to undertake for us who is bound to pay nothing for himself; and therefore one, all whose obedience may justly be set upon our account, and be reckoned as performed in our steads and upon our account. And such a person as this is we can nowhere find out, unless it be among the Persons of the glorious Trinity; every one of which is perfectly God, and therefore none of them is bound to do more than the other, but whatsoever he doth which the other doth not may justly be accounted as a work of supererogation; and therefore, without violation of justice may be imputed to others, and others may be accounted as obedient by it. By which means such a Person, and none but such a Person, can perform that obedience, and so pay that debt to God for us which is due from us to God. And as none but one that is equal to God can perform obedience for us, so neither can any but such a Person make satisfaction to the justice of God for our disobedience to his laws. For that satisfaction cannot be made otherwise than by bearing the punishments that are due from God to man, for the sins that are committed by man against God: which sins, being committed against an infinite God, cannot but deserve infinite punishments, which all creatures, in that they are creatures, and so finite, are both unable and incapable of undergoing. And therefore as there is none but one that is God, coequal with the Father, can perform obedience to God's precepts for our souls, so neither can any but one that is coequal with the Father make satisfaction to God's justice for our sins. And so if Christ be our Jesus and Saviour, he must of necessity be God.

Fourthly, That he is man as well as God, reason concludes from the same premises upon which it builds his Godhead: for as he could not be our Saviour and Mediator unless he were God, so neither could he be the Saviour of us unless he was a man like to us. So that he must be man as well as God, or God-man, in order to his[r] mediating betwixt God and man. He must be man, that he may be capable of being bound for us; as well as God, that he may be able to pay our debts. It was man that stood engaged in the covenant, and therefore man must perform the conditions of it. Neither is it only reasonable, but absolutely necessary, that Christ should be man as well as God, in order to his redeeming us from prison by paying our debts for us: for as he could neither perform obedience, nor satisfy justice for us, unless he were God as well as man; so neither could he do either of these things for us, unless he was man as well as God. First, If he was only God, he could not perform any righteousness for us, which by imputation might be laid upon us. For God in himself is the maker of the laws, and therefore in himself cannot be subject to them. Especially, not upon the account of man, because the laws were made for men; and therefore man cannot be accounted righteous by any other righteousness than what is performed by man. The fallen angels were not accounted righteous by the righteousness of Christ, because he was a man, not an angel, that did perform it: so neither could man be accepted as righteous by it, if he had been God only, and not man. Secondly, As he could not pay the principal, so neither the accessory debt for us, unless he be man as well as God. For without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins: nor, therefore, any satisfaction to justice: sins could be pardoned, if justice might be satisfied any other ways, the remission of sins necessarily following upon the satisfaction of justice. Whereas, it is

---

[r] That Christ, not as God only and not man, nor as man only and not God, but as both God and man, or as God-man, is our Mediator, to satisfy and intercede for us, and so that he must be both in order to his being our Mediator, the Fathers often inculcate; *Οὐ γὰρ μόνον ὑπάρχων Θεὸς ἐκλήθη μεσίτης, πῶς γὰρ ἂν ἐμεσίτευσεν ἡμῖν καὶ Θεῷ μηδὲν ἔχων ἡμέτερον; ἐπεὶ δὲ ὡς Θεὸς συνῆπται τῷ πατρὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχων ἐξουσίαν· ὡς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἡμῖν, ἐξ ἡμῶν γὰρ ἔλαβε τὴν τοῦ δούλου μορφὴν εἰκότως μεσίτης ὠνόμασται, συνάπτων ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ διεστῶτα, τῇ ἑνότητι τῶν φύσεων θεότητος λέγω καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος.* Theodor. Dial. 2. c. 5. [vol. IV. p. 56.] *Οὕτω γὰρ ἔστι μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων Θεὸς ὢν καὶ ἄνθρωπος γεγονὼς, οὐ τραπεὶς τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ καθ᾽ ἑκάτερα πρὸς τὰ ἀμφότερα μεσιτεύων.* Epiphan. in Anchorat. [xliv.] Revera homo salvari non potuit, si vel susceptor hominis naturaliter verus Deus non fuit, vel in veri Dei susceptione aliquid hominis defuit. Fulgent. ad Thrasimundum, lib. I. [c. ii.] Dum redemptionis commercium gereretur, pleno veroque homini plenum verumque Deum decebat uniri. Ibid. lib. III. [c. ii.] *Θεὸς ἀνθρώπῳ ἑνωθείς ἐστι μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ὁ αὐτὸς Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος.* Athan. [vol. II.] de Trinit. Dial. 5. [18.] *Ἔδει γὰρ τὸν μεσίτην Θεοῦ τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς ἰδίας πρὸς ἑκάτερον*

οἰκειότητος εἰς φιλίαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους συναγαγεῖν, καὶ Θεῷ μὲν παραστῆσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀνθρώποις δὲ γνωρίσαι τὸν Θεόν. Iren. l. 3. c. 20. [p. 211.] Ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ὀφείλει ἀμφοτέροις κοινωνεῖν ὧν ἔστι μεσίτης. μεσίτου γὰρ τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ ἑκατέρων ἐχόμενον ὧν ἔστι μεσίτης κοινωνεῖν. ἐὰν δὲ τοῦ μὲν ἑνὸς ἔχηται, τοῦ δὲ ἑνὸς ἀπεσχοινισμένος ᾖ οὐκέτι μεσίτης ἐστίν. εἰ τοίνυν μὴ ἔχεται τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς φύσεως οὐκ ἔστι μεσίτης ἀλλ' ἀπεσχοίνισται. Chrysost. in 1 ad Timoth. hom. 7. [IV. 276. 38.] Ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἂν ἐγένετο μεσίτης, ἔδει γὰρ καὶ τῷ Θεῷ διαλέγεσθαι. Θεὸς οὐκ ἂν ἐγένετο μεσίτης, οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἷς ἐμεσίτευσεν. Ibid. [277. 1.] Inde et mediator Dei et hominum, quia Deus cum Patre, quia homo cum hominibus. Non mediator homo præter deitatem; non mediator Deus præter humanitatem. Ecce mediator, divinitas sine humanitate non est mediatrix; humanitas sine divinitate non est mediatrix: sed inter divinitatem solam et humanitatem solam mediatrix est humana divinitas et divina humanitas Christi. Aug. [vol. V.] de ovibus, c. 12. [Ser. xlvii. 20.]

impossible for one that is only God to shed blood, or bear any punishment whatsoever: he cannot shed blood, because he hath none to shed; nor bear any punishments whatsoever, whereby the justice of God could be satisfied for the sins of men. For God is a pure Act, and by consequence uncapable of any suffering or passion, as I have shewed before. And therefore if he was God only, and not man, he could not suffer any thing whereby to satisfy: as well as if he was man only, and not God, he could not satisfy by his sufferings[s]. Unless he was a man as well as God, he could not suffer; and unless he was God as well as man he could not satisfy. If he was man only, his satisfaction could not be sufficient for God; if he was God only, it would not be suitable for man. And therefore to make him capable of suffering for men, and able to satisfy God, himself must be both God and man. And not only so, but,

Lastly, He must be both *God and man in one Person:* otherwise he would be as far from being our Saviour as if he was man only and not God, or God only and not man. Man can suffer, but he cannot satisfy; God can satisfy, but he cannot suffer: and therefore if he was God in one Person, and man in another, he might suffer in one and satisfy in another, but both suffer and satisfy in neither. But for the making of his sufferings for men satisfactory to God, it is necessary the Person that suffers should be the same with him that satisfieth: for it is upon the union of these two natures in one Person that the value and satisfactoriness of his sufferings dependeth. He therefore by his sufferings made satisfaction, because the same Person that suffered was God as well as man. And hence it is that the properties of one nature are often [t] communicated to the other; because, though they be two natures, they be both united in one Person. So that though we cannot say that either the Godhead suffered or the manhood satisfied, yet we may say God both suffered and satisfied, or man both satisfied and suffered; because, whether we call him God or man, still both natures are implied; so that he that is God is man as well as God, and he that is man is God as well as man. Hence, I say, it is, that his sufferings, as they were suitable for men, so were they sufficient for God; for though his Godhead did not suffer, yet he that was God did suffer; and though his manhood did not satisfy, yet he that was man did. Whereas, if he had been God in one Person and man in another, his sufferings would have been only the sufferings of man, and so not satisfactory to God; and his satisfaction would have been only the satisfaction of God, and so not suitable for man. Which things being considered, as we cannot, yea, dare not deny him to be both God and man, so we dare not but believe him to be *both God and man in one and the same Person:* [u] that as the soul and body united together make one man, so do the Divine and human nature make one Christ and Mediator, *blessed for evermore.*

---

[s] Ὁρᾷς καὶ ἀκούεις τὸν αὐτὸν ἅμα Θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον· εἰ γὰρ Θεὸς μόνον ἦν, πῶς ἔπασχε; πῶς ἐσταυροῦτο; καὶ ἀπέθνησκεν; ἀλλότρια γὰρ ταῦτα Θεοῦ· καὶ εἰ ἄνθρωπος μόνον, πῶς διὰ πάθους ἐνίκα, ἔσωζεν, ἐζωοποιεῖ; ταῦτα ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον ἦν. Athanas. [vol. II.] Orat. de uno Christo, [p. 51.] Εἰ μόνον ἄνθρωπος ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἂν ἔσωζεν τὸν κοσμόν· καὶ εἰ μόνον Θεὸς οὐκ ἂν διὰ πάθους ἔσωζεν· ἑκατέρα δὲ Χριστὸς καὶ Θεὸς ἄρα ἐστὶ καὶ ἄνθρωπος. Id. dialog. de S. Trinit. l. V. [18. p. 535.] Καὶ νῦν εὐγνωμόνως· ἀνάγκη γὰρ τῷ πάθει ἀνθρωπότητα ὑποκεῖσθαι, καὶ τῆς ζωῆς θεότητα ἡγεῖσθαι· οὔτε οὖν ἐζωοποίει μὴ ὢν Θεὸς, οὔτε ἔπασχεν ἑκουσίως μὴ ὢν ἄνθρωπος· ἀμφότερα δὲ Χριστὸς, καὶ ἔπαθεν καὶ ἐζωοποίει. Θεὸς ἄρα ἐστὶ καὶ ἄνθρωπος. Ibid. [19.]

[t] Per indissolubilem unitatem Verbi et carnis omnia quæ carnis

And this hath been the doctrine of the Church of Christ in all ages. As, first, That the Word was begotten of the Father, and that from everlasting. Justin Martyr expressly:

---

sunt ascribuntur et Verbo, quomodo et quæ Verbi sunt prædicantur in carne. Jesum vero et Christum et Dominum invenimus sæpe ad utramque naturam referri; ut est illud, *Unus Dominus noster Jesus Christus, per quem omnia.* Et iterum, *Si cognovissent, nunquam Dominum gloriæ crucifixissent.* Origen. in Rom. l. 1. [6. vol. IV. p. 467.] Ac per hoc propter istam unitatem personæ in utraque natura intelligendam et Filius hominis dicitur descendisse de cœlis, quamvis sit ex ea quæ fuerat in terra Virgine assumptus; et Filius Dei dicitur crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus; quamvis hæc non in divinitate ipsa qua est unigenitus Patri coæternus; sed in naturæ humanæ sit infirmitate perpessus. Aug. [vol. VIII. p. 629.] contra serm. Arrian. c. 8. [init.] Hanc unitatem personæ Christi Jesu Domini nostri sic ex natura utraque constantem, divina viz. et humana, ut quælibet earum vocabulum etiam alteri impertiat, et divina humanæ, et humana divinæ beatus ostendit apostolus, &c. Ibid. *Διὰ τὴν ἀκριβῆ ἑνότητα τῆς τε προσληφθείσης σαρκὸς καὶ προσλαβομένης θεότητος ἀντιμεθίσταται τὰ ὀνόματα, ὥστε καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τῷ θείῳ, καὶ τὸ θεῖον τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ κατονομάζεσθαι.* Gregor. Nyssen. Epist. ad Theoph. [vol. III. p. 265.] V. et Leon. epist. ad Flavian.

[u] Sicut enim unus est homo anima rationalis et caro; sic unus est Christus Deus et homo. Aug. [vol. III. par. ii.] in Joh. Tract. 78. [3.] *Ὥσπὲρ γὰρ ψυχὴ λογικὴ καὶ σὰρξ εἷς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, οὕτως Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος εἷς ἐστι Χριστός.* Athanas. in symb. [vol. II. p. 729.]

[x] "But the Word of Wisdom testifies this unto me, he being God himself, begotten of the Father of all things; being also the Word, and the wisdom, and the strength, and the glory of him that did beget him." And again, [y] "You understand, oh hearers, if you attend, that the word holds forth, that this offspring was begotten of the Father before all creatures whatsoever; and that he that was begotten is another in number from him that did beget him, every one will confess." And Athanasius begins the exposition of the Christian faith thus [z]: "We believe in one unbegotten God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things, visible and invisible, who hath of himself what he is; and in one only-begotten Word, the Wisdom and the Son, without beginning, and from everlasting, begotten of the Father." And so St. Hilary: [a] "The Son is from him who is the Father. The only-begotten from the unbegotten: the offspring from the parent: the living from the living. As the Father hath life in himself, so is it given to the Son to have life in himself. Perfect of perfect; all of all, without division or scission; because one is in the other, and the fulness of the Godhead in the Son. Incomprehensible of incomprehensible; for none know their minds but one another. Invisible of invisible; because he is the image of the invisible God: and *he that seeth the Son seeth the Father also.* One of the other; because they are Father and Son: not as

---

[x] Μαρτυρήσει δέ μοι ὁ λόγος τῆς σοφίας αὐτὸς ὢν οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων γεννηθεὶς, καὶ λόγος, καὶ σοφία, καὶ δύναμις, καὶ δόξα τοῦ γεννήσαντος ὑπάρχων. Justin. Dial. cum Tryphone, [61.]

[y] Νοεῖτε, ὦ ἀκροαταὶ, εἰ γὲ καὶ τὸν νοῦν προσέχετε, καὶ ὅτι γεγεννῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦτο τὸ γέννημα πρὸ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ λόγος ἐδήλου, καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον τοῦ γεννῶντος ἀριθμῷ ἕτερόν ἐστι, πᾶς ὅστισουν ὁμολογήσειε. Ibid. [129.]

[z] Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα ἀγέννητον Θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ποιητὴν ὁρατῶντε καὶ ἀοράτων, τὸν ἔχοντα ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ τὸ εἶναι· καὶ εἰς ἕνα μονογενῆ λόγον, σοφίαν, υἱὸν, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀνάρχως καὶ ἀϊδίως γεγεννημένον. Athan. in expos. fid. [vol. I. p. 99.]

[a] Est Filius ab eo qui Pater est, unigenitus ab ingenito, progenies a Parente, vivus a vivo. Ut Pater habet vitam in semetipso, ita et Filio data est vita in semetipso. Perfectus a perfecto, quia totus a toto; non divisio aut scissio, quia alter in altero, et plenitudo divinitatis in Filio est. Incomprehensibilis ab incomprehensibili; novit enim nemo nisi invicem. Invisibilis ab invisibili, quia imago Dei invisibilis est, et quia qui *videt Filium videt et Patrem.* Alius ab alio, quia Pater et Filius. Non natura Divinitatis alia et alia, quia ambo unum. Deus a Deo, ab uno ingenito Deo, unus unigenitus Deus. Non dii duo, sed unus ab uno; non ingeniti duo, quia natus est ab innato. Hilar. de Trin. lib. II. [11.]

if the nature of the Divinity was one and another, for they are both the same. God of God; of one unbegotten God; one only begotten God. Not two Gods, but one of one: not two unbegottens; for one is begotten of the other unbegotten." And again: [b]"Therefore this unbegotten God did of himself before all time beget his Son: not of any subject matter, for all things are by the Son; nor of nothing, because of himself he begot his Son." And St. Augustine: [c]"The Word of God was always with the Father, and always the Word; and because the Word, therefore the Son. He was always therefore the Son, and always equal; for he is not equal by growth, but by birth. Who was always born of the Father, the Son God of God, coeternal of eternal. The Father is not God of the Son, but the Son is God of the Father; therefore did the Father by begetting of the Son give him to be God; by begetting of him gave him to be coeternal with himself; by begetting of him gave him to be equal with himself."

And as the Fathers speak of the Son's being begotten from eternity of the Father, so do they much contend for his being *very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father.* As Ignatius: [d]"If any one saith there is but one God, and confesseth Christ Jesus, but thinks the Lord to be a bare man, and not the only-begotten God, the wisdom and word of God, but thinks that he consisteth only of soul and body; such a one is a serpent, preaching deceit and error to the destruction of men." And Justin Martyr, having disputed long with Trypho the Jew, at the length says, [e]"And that Christ, who is the Lord and God, being the Son of God, and having appeared before in power as a man and an angel, both appeared in the glory of fire, as in the bush, and in the judgment that fell upon Sodom, is abundantly proved by what hath been said." And so Tertullian[f]: "Neither are we ashamed of Christ, seeing it delights us to be judged and condemned for his sake. Him we have learned to be born of God, and being born, to have been begotten, and therefore to be the Son of God, and called God from the unity of his substance," viz. being of one essence or substance with the Father. And this is that which Athanasius so confidently affirms through all his works: I shall produce only one place. We believe Christ to be "[g]Omnipotent of omnipotent; for whatsoever the Father rules and governs, that doth the Son rule and govern too. Perfect of perfect; in all things like unto the Father." But for this we have a whole synod of Fathers, the first general council that ever was, express and clear, having delivered their mind concerning this particular in these words: [h]"We believe in one God Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only begotten; that is, of the substance of the Father. God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of the same substance with the Father," or of one substance with the Father, as the convocation that composed these Articles expressed it. Neither was this council the first that used the phrase of *one substance with the Father*, for we see Tertullian using of it long before; and Athanasius saith, that it was not [i]invented by the council, but taken out of the Fathers that lived before them.

---

[b] Hic ergo ingenitus ante omne tempus ex se Filium genuit, non ex aliqua subjacente materia, quia per Filium omnia; non ex nihilo quia ex se Filium. Ibid. l. III. [3.]

[c] Verbum Dei semper cum Patre, et semper verbum; et quia verbum, ideo Filius. Semper ergo Filius et semper equalis. Non enim crescendo sed nascendo equalis est. Qui semper natus est de Patre Filius, de Deo Deus, de æterno coeternus. Pater autem non de Filio Deus, sed Filius de Patre Deus. Ideo Pater Filio gignendo dedit ut Deus esset; gignendo dedit ut sibi coeternus esset; gignendo dedit ut equalis esset. Aug. [vol. III. par. ii.] in Joh. Tract. 48. [6.]

[d] Ἐὰν τὶς λέγῃ μὲν ἕνα Θεὸν ὁμολογῇ δὲ καὶ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ψιλὸν δὲ ἄνθρωπον εἶναι νομίζῃ τὸν Κύριον οὐχὶ Θεὸν μονογενῆ, καὶ σοφίαν, καὶ λόγον Θεοῦ ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος αὐτὸν μόνον εἶναι νομίζῃ, ὁ τοιοῦτος ὄφις ἐστὶν ἀπάτην καὶ πλάνην κηρύττων ἐπ᾽ ἀπωλείᾳ ἀνθρώπων. Ignat. Epist. ad Philadelph. [p. 101.]

[e] Καὶ ὅτι Κύριος ὢν ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Θεὸς, Θεοῦ υἱὸς ὑπάρχων, καὶ δυνάμει φαινόμενος πρότερον ὡς ἀνὴρ, καὶ ἄγγελος, καὶ ἐν πυρὸς δόξῃ ὡς ἐν τῇ βάτῳ πέφανται, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεγενημένης ἐπὶ Σόδομα ἀποδέδεικται ἐν πόλλοις τοῖς εἰρημένοις. Justin. Dial. cum Tryphone, [128.]

---

[f] Neque de Christo erubescimus cum sub nomine ejus deputari et damnari juvat.—— Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, et prolatione generatum, et idcirco Filium Dei et Deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ. Tertul. Apol. adv. gentes [cap. xxi.]

[g] Παντοκράτορα ἐκ παντοκράτορος· πάντων γὰρ ὧν ἄρχει ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ κρατεῖ, ἄρχει καὶ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ κρατεῖ· ὅλος ἐξ ὅλου, ὅμοιος τῷ πατρὶ ὤν. Athan. in expos. fid. [vol. I. p. 99.]

[h] Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννήθεντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί. Concil. Nicæn. in symb. [Athan. Ep. ad Jov. 3. vol. I. p. 781.]

[i] Οἱ δὲ ἐπίσκοποι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς εὑρόντες τὰς λέξεις ἀλλ' ἐκ πατέρων ἔχοντες τὴν μαρτυρίαν οὕτως ἔγραψαν. Ἐπίσκοποι γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι πρὸ ἐτῶν ἐγγύς που ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα τῆς μεγάλης Ῥωμῆς, καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας

We have seen how express the Fathers are in avouching Christ to be God, and truly they are as express too in averring him to be man. As Ignatius[k]: "Mary did therefore truly conceive a body, having God inhabiting in it; and God the Word was truly born of the Virgin, clothed with a body of the like passions with us. He was truly conceived in the womb, who formeth all men in the womb, and made himself a body of the blood of the Virgin only, without the help of man. He was carried in the womb the set time that we are, and was truly born as we are." And so Athanasius[l]: "But on the other side, when once the Word was born of Mary in the fulness of time, to take away sin, (for so it pleased the Father to send his Son, *made of a woman, made under the law,*) then it is written, that taking flesh he became man, and in that suffered for us, as Peter said; for Christ (saith he) suffering for us in the flesh, that it might be evident, and all might believe, that being God from eternity, and sanctifying whom he came unto, and disposing all things according to the will of the Father, at the last he became man for us. And the Godhead, as the Apostle saith, dwelt in the flesh *bodily*, which is all one as if we should say, being God he took to himself a body, and using that as an instrument became man for us." And again: [m] "For the body which our Saviour had of

---

πόλεως, γραφόντες ᾐτιάσαντο τοὺς ποίημα λέγοντας τὸν υἱὸν καὶ μὴ ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί. Athanas. in epist. ad Africanos episcopos, [6. vol. I. p. 896.]

[k] *Ἀληθῶς τοίνυν ἐγέννησε Μαρία σῶμα Θεὸν ἔνοικον ἔχον· καὶ ἀληθῶς ἐγέννηθε ὁ Θεὸς λόγος ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, σῶμα ὁμοιοπαθὲς ἡμῖν ἠμφιεσμένος. ἀληθῶς γέγονεν ἐν μήτρᾳ ὁ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐν μήτρᾳ διαπλάττων, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ σῶμα ἐκ τοῦ τῆς παρθένου αἵματος, πλὴν ὅσον ἄνευ ὁμιλίας ἀνδρός· ἐκυοφόρηθε ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς χρόνων περιόδοις, καὶ ἀληθῶς ἐτέχθη ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς.* Ignat. Epist. ad Trallianos, [p. 76.]

[l] *Ὅτε δὲ ἐκ Μαρίας ἐπεδήμησεν ἄνθρωπος ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας· οὕτω γὰρ εὐδοκήσας ὁ Πατὴρ ἔπεμψε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, τότε εἴρηται ὅτι σάρκα προσλαβὼν γεγένηται ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ πέπονθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Πετρὸς, Χρίστου οὖν παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκὶ, ἵνα δειχθῇ, καὶ πάντες πιστεύσωμεν ὅτι ἀεὶ Θεὸς ὢν καὶ ἁγιάζων πρὸς οὓς ἐγένετο, διακοσμῶν τε κατὰ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ πατρὸς τὰ πάντα, ὕστερον καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος· καὶ σωματικῶς, ὥς φησιν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, κατῴκησεν ἡ Θεότης ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ, ἶσον τῷ φάναι, Θεὸς ὢν ἴδιον ἔσχε σῶμα, καὶ τούτῳ χρώμενας ὀργάνῳ ἄνθρωπος γέγονε δι' ἡμᾶς.* Athanas. contra Arian. [Orat. III. 31. vol. I. p. 580.]

[m] *Ἀνθρώπινον ἄρα φύσει τὸ ἐκ Μαρίας κατὰ τὰς θείας γραφὰς, καὶ ἀληθινὸν ἦν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ σωτῆρος. ἀληθινὸν δὲ ἦν ἐπεὶ ταὐτὸν ἦν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ, ἀδελφὴ γὰρ ἡμῶν ἡ Μαρία.* Id. Epist. ad Epictetum, [7. p. 906.]

Mary, according to the Divine scripture, was by nature a human and a true body. It was a true one, because it was the same with ours, for Mary was our sister."

And as for the last thing, that Christ is *both God and man in one Person*, the same Father is clear: [n] "Christ is but one Person, compounded of God and the human nature, as every common man is of the animal and rational part." And St. Augustine: [o] "Neither because he said (by the obedience) of one man did he separate God, because he became man; because, as I have said, and it is to be observed, he is one Person. For he is but one Christ, the Son of God from eternity by nature, and the Son of man which in time was assumed." Again, [p] "Let us acknowledge a twofold substance in Christ, to wit, the Divine in which he is equal to the Father, and the human in which the Father is greater than he. But both together, Christ is not two but one; lest God should be a quaternity, not a Trinity. For as the rational soul and body are one man, so is God and man one Christ." I shall conclude this with that excellent passage of St. Chrysostome; [q] "When thou hearest of Christ, do not think him God only or man only, but both together. For I know Christ was hungry, and I know that with five loaves he fed five thousand men, besides women and children. I know Christ was thirsty, and I know Christ turned water into wine. I know Christ was carried in a ship, and I know Christ walked upon the waters. I know Christ died, and I know Christ raised the dead. I know Christ was set before Pilate, and I know Christ sits with the Father. I know Christ was worshipped by the angels, and I know Christ was stoned by the Jews. And truly, some of these I ascribe to the human, the other to the Divine nature; for by reason of this is he said to be both together."

---

[n] *Χριστὸς ἓν πρόσωπόν ἐστι συντεθὲν ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ὡς πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὁ κοινὸς ἐκ ζώου καὶ λογικοῦ.* Id. de Trin. Dial. 5. [24. vol. II. p. 536.]

[o] Nec quia dixit hominis separavit Deum, quia hominem assumpsit: quia sicut dixi, et valde commendandum est, una persona est. Ipse namque unus Christus et Dei Filius semper natura, et hominis Filius qui in tempore assumptus est. Aug. [vol. VIII. p. 629.] contra serm. Arrianorum, c. 8.

[p] Agnoscamus geminam substantiam Christi, divinam viz. qua æqualis est Patri, et humanam, qua major est Pater. Utrumque autem simul non duo, sed unus est Christus. Ne sit quaternitas non trinitas Deus. Sicut enim unus est homo anima rationalis et caro, sic unus est Christus Deus et homo. Id. [vol. III. par. ii.] in Joh. Tract. 78. [3.]

[q] *Χριστόν δε ὅταν ἀκούσῃς μὴ τὸν Θεὸν λογίσῃ μόνον, μηδὲ τὴν ἔνσαρκον οἰκονομίαν μόνην, ἀλλὰ τὸ συναμφότερον.——ἐπεὶ οἶδα Χριστὸν πεινάσαντα, καὶ οἶδα Χριστὸν ἐκ πέντε ἄρτων πεντακισχιλίους ἄνδρας θρέψαντα χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων· οἶδα Χριστὸν διψήσαντα, καὶ οἶδα Χριστὸν τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς οἶνον μεταβάλοντα· οἶδα Χριστὸν πλεύσαντα, καὶ οἶδα Χριστὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων περιπατήσαντα· οἶδα Χριστὸν ἀποθανόντα, καὶ οἶδα Χριστὸν νέκρους ἐγείραντα, καὶ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ τὸν ναὸν ἀναστήσαντα· οἶδα Χριστὸν Πιλάτῳ παρεστῶτα, καὶ οἶδα Χριστὸν τῷ πατρὶ συγκαθήμενον· οἶδα Χριστὸν ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων προσκυνούμενον, καὶ οἶδα Χριστὸν ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων λιθαζόμενον. Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπάγω τῇ θεότητι, τά δε τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι· διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο συναμφότερον εἴρηται.* Chrysost. Λογ. εἰς τὸν τίμιον σταυρόν. [vol. VII. p. 503.]

But besides particular persons, there are many ancient councils that determined this truth; but passing by [r] others, I shall only cite the fourth general council gathered together at Chalcedon, both because it was a general council consisting of no less than 630 bishops, and also because it was called on purpose to confirm this truth; and when assembled they defined amongst other things that Christ [s] was begotten of the Father as to his Divinity before all ages, and that in the last days, for us and for our salvation, he was born according to his humanity of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God, and that he is made known as one and the same Jesus Christ, the Son, Lord, and only-begotten, in two natures, without confusion, conversion, division, or separation. The difference betwixt the two natures being no ways changed by their union, but rather the propriety of both natures preserved, and making up one Person and one subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons. And thus we have the first part of this article confirmed from scripture, reason, and Fathers: the next followeth.

---

[r] V. Concil. Hispal. 2. c. 13. [vol. III. p. 562.] Tolet. 6. c. 1. [Ibid. p. 601.]

[s] *Πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου καὶ θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν υἱὸν, κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον, οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐχ ὡς εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον.* Concil. Chalced. apud Evagr. hist. eccles. l. 2. [vol. III. p. 291.]

Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

That the Second Person in the sacred Trinity was begotten of the First from eternity, and conceived by the Third in time, and that in the womb of a virgin; and so became both perfectly God and perfectly man, perfectly united together in the same Person, we have seen in the foregoing part of this article. And in this we are to dive into the reason of this so great a mystery, why did the Son of God thus become the Son of man? Why did he thus take the human nature into his Divine Person? When he came from heaven to earth, what did he before he went again from earth to heaven? How did he deport himself towards his fellow-creatures, and how did they carry themselves towards him? Did they not highly honour and extol him, who had so honoured and extolled them as to assume their humanity into his Divinity? No: he was so far from being honoured amongst them, that he truly *suffered, was crucified, dead and buried.* But it is strange so great a Deity should be loaded with so much ignominy. Was it for his own sake he suffered all this? No: it was to reconcile God to our souls, and to be a propitiation for our sins.

First, he *suffered:* though God be without passions, yet God-man is not without his sufferings. Whilst God and not man, he could not suffer if he would, neither would he suffer if he could. But when he was man as well as God, he both could suffer what he would, and would suffer what he could; and not only could and would, but did truly (and not in show only, as the Cerdonites, Manichæans, and others, asserted) suffer many things in his life, and most of all at his death. For he was then crucified, which was a punishment usual amongst the Romans till abrogated by Constantine the Great, who, being the first Christian emperor, is thought to have forbidden it out of the respect and honour he had unto him whom we have here asserted to have undergone it, and so to have honoured it[t]. He *was crucified;* that is[u], there being first a straight and erect piece of wood (which himself first carried towards the place of execution) made fast in the earth, and a transverse beam fastened towards the top of it, and after that another piece of wood fastened to and standing out from that which was fixed in the ground; his body being lifted up was applied to the straight piece of wood that stood in the earth, his hands were nailed to the transverse beam that went across or athwart over the other, his head reached above the transverse beam towards the top of that which was fixed in the ground; and towards the bottom of it were his feet nailed, his body resting upon that other piece of wood which was fastened into and stood out from that which was fixed in the earth. Upon his head was a crown of thorns, above his head was a table fastened, on which, after the Roman custom, his accusation was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin characters, that all might read what it was he was there nailed and crucified for. Neither was Jesus only thus nailed and fastened to the cross, but there he hung till his soul was forced from his body, and so he *died.* After which, he was not suffered any longer to hang there, but was taken down, and laid in a sepulchre, and so *buried.*

---

[t] Sed quia ipse honoraturus erat fideles suos in fine hujus seculi, prius honoravit crucem in hoc seculo, ut terrarum principes credentes in eum prohiberent aliquem nocentium crucifigi. Aug. [vol. V. p. 473.] de verbis Domini in Evang. sec. Mat. Serm. [LXXXVIII. 8.] Denique modo in pœnis reorum non est apud Romanos, ubi enim Domini crux honorata est, putatum est quod et reus honoraretur si crucifigeretur. Aug. [vol. III. par. ii. p. 546.] in Joh. Tract. 36. [4.] Ad illam postremo crucem non pervenies, quia jam de pœna generis humani sublata est. Cum enim sub antiquis scelerati crucifigerentur, modo nullus crucifigitur. Honorata est et finita est; finita est in pœna, manet in gloria. Id. [vol. IV. p. 267.] in Psa. 36. [ser. ii. 4.] *Πρότερον μὲν γὰρ ὁ σταυρὸς ὄνομα καταδίκης ἦν, νυνὶ δὲ πρᾶγμα τιμῆς γέγονεν.* Chrysost. *εἰς τὸν σταυρόν.* [vol. V. p. 567.]

[u] The form or figure of the cross we may most clearly discover out of Justin Martyr, who saith, *Μονοκέρωτος γὰρ κέρατα οὐδενὸς ἄλλου πράγματος ἢ σχήματος ἔχει ἄν τις εἰπεῖν καὶ ἀποδεῖξαι εἰ μὴ τοῦ τύπου, ὃς τὸν σταυρὸν δείκνυσιν· ὄρθιον γὰρ τὸ ἕν ἐστι ξύλον, ἀφ' οὗ ἐστι τὸ ἀνώτατον μέρος εἰς κέρας ὑπερῃρμένον, ὅταν τὸ ἄλλο ξύλον προσαρμοσθῇ καὶ ἑκατέρωθεν ὡς κέρατα τῷ ἑνὶ κέρατι παρεζευγμένα τὰ ἄκρα φαίνηται· καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ πηγνύμενον, ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξέχον ἐστὶν, ἐφ' οὗ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι· καὶ βλέπεται ὡς κέρας, καὶ αὐτὸ σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις κέρασι συνεσχηματισμένον, καὶ πεπηγμένον.* Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Judæo. [91.] *Τὸ γὰρ ῥῦσαι ἀπὸ ῥομφαίας τὴν ψυχήν μου, καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς κυνὸς τὴν μονογενῆ μου, σωσόν με ἐκ στόματος λεόντος, καὶ ἀπὸ κεράτων μονοκερώτων τὴν ταπείνωσίν μου, ὁμοίως μηνύοντος δι' οὗ πάθους ἔμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν, τουτέστι σταυροῦσθαι· τὸ γὰρ, κεράτων μονοκερώτων, ὅτι τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐστὶ μόνου προεξηγησάμην ὑμῖν.* Ibid. [105.] From whence we may perceive, how the cross was not only one piece of wood set in the ground, and another athwart upon the top of it, as it is usually pictured; but there was a third piece of wood fastened about the midst of that which stood upon the ground, *ἐφ' οὗ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι*: which is the same also that Irenæus means, when he saith, Natatoria piscina quinque habebat porticus, unde dominus paralyticum sanum in suam domum ire præcepit. Ipse habitus crucis fines et summitates habet quinque, duos in longitudine, et duos in latitudine et unum in medio, ubi requiescit qui clavis affigitur. Iren. adv. hæres. l. ii. c. [24. 4. p. 151.]

Neither did he mind his own things in all this; no, it was only upon their account that laid these things upon him, that he was pleased to undergo them. He suffered for us, only that we might not suffer from God; he was crucified here, that we might be glorified hereafter; he died that we might live, and was buried for a time, that we might not be damned to eternity; for *he suffered, was crucified, dead and buried,* and all to reconcile God to us. Man naturally is at odds with God; God hates man's person, and man God's precepts. To make up this enmity betwixt them, Christ joined both their natures in one Person, and so shedding the blood of the human, with it he appeased the wrath of the Divine nature, and so *reconciled his Father to us,* not only by quenching the fire of his anger towards us, but also by purchasing his love and favour for us. And by this means also, laying down his life for us, he offered himself a sacrifice to God, *a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men;* a sin-offering, to propitiate God and obtain his pardon, not only for the natural corruption of our sinful hearts, but also for the actual provocations of our sinful lives. All which appears from the light both of Scripture and reason too.

And truly that Christ *suffered, was crucified, dead and buried,* is the whole sum and substance of both Law, Prophets, and Gospel; the first, foreshewing it in types; the second, [x] foretelling it in prophecies; the third, relating

---

[x] Lactantius, l. iv. de vera sap. c. 18. [p. 322.] doth not only produce the prophets, but the Sibylline oracles also as foretelling that Christ should suffer. Hæc autem (saith he) sic futura fuisse, et prophetarum vocibus et Sibyllinis carminibus denunciatum est. Apud Isaiam ita scriptum invenitur, *Non sum contumax, neque contradico; dorsum*

meum posui ad flagella, et maxillas meas ad palmas, &c. Sibylla quoque eadem futura monstravit;

Εἰς ἀνόμους χεῖρας καὶ ἀπίστων ὕστερον ἥξει,
Δώσουσι δὲ Θεῷ ῥαπίσματα χέρσιν ἀνάγνοις,
Καὶ στόμασιν μιαροῖσι τὰ πτύσματα φαρμακοέντα,
Δώσει δ᾽ εἰς μαστίγας ἁπλῶς ἁγνὸν τότε νῶτον.

Item de silentio ejus quod usque ad mortem pertinaciter tenuit, Esaias iterum sic locutus est, *Sicut ovis ad immolandum ductus est, et sicut agnus coram tondentibus se sine voce, sic non aperuit os suum.* Et Sibylla supradicta,

Καὶ κολαφιζόμενος σιγήσει μήτις ἐπιγνῷ
Τὶς λόγος, ἢ πόθεν ἦλθεν, ἵνα φθιμένοισι λαλήσῃ,
Καὶ στέφανον φορέσει τὸν ἀκάνθινον——

De cibo vero et potu quem antequam eum figerent illi obtulerunt, David in Psalmo 68. sic ait, *Et dederunt in escam meam fel, et in siti mea potum mihi dederunt acetum.* Item hoc futurum etiam Sibylla concionata est;

Εἰς δὲ τὸ βρῶμα χολὴν, κ᾽ εἰς δίψαν ὄξος ἔδωκαν,
Τῆς ἀφιλοξενίης ταύτην δείξουσι τράπεζαν.

Et alia Sibylla Judæam terram his versibus increpat,

Αὐτὴ γὰρ σὺ ἄφρων τὸν σὸν Θεὸν οὐκ ἐνοήσας
Παίζοντ᾽ ἐν θνητοῖσι νοήμασιν, ἀλλὰ κ᾽ ἀκάνθαις
᾽Εστρέψας στεφάνῳ φοβερήν τε χολὴν ἐκέρασας.

Of the four first of these Sibylline verses, the two last are not read in the Sibylline Oracles now extant; but the two first are, in the eighth book, p. [62.] though something altered, thus:

Εἰς ἀνόμων χεῖρας, καὶ ἀπίστων ὕστατον ἥξει,
Καὶ δώσουσι Θεῷ ῥαπίσματα χέρσιν ἀνάγνοις.

The second three verses, beginning Καὶ κολαφιζόμενος, &c. are read in the same eighth book, [ibid.] only for the beginning of the second of them, Τὶς λόγος—we have now, Τὶς, τίνος ὤν.—The two next in the books now extant come immediately after, χέρσιν ἀνάγνοις, in the four first here mentioned, but something altered, thus:

Εἰς δὲ τὸ βρῶμα χολὴν καὶ πιεῖν ὄξος ἔδωκαν,
Τῆς δὲ φιλοξενίης ταύτης τίσουσι τράπεζαν.

The three last we have also now extant in the sixth book of the Sibylline Oracles, [p. 52.] but the two first thus altered:

Αὐτὴ γὰρ δυσφρῶν τὸν σὸν νόμον οὐκ ἐνοήσας,
Πταίοντα θνητοῖσι νοήμασιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀκάνθης.

But St. Augustine read them in Lactantius as we now do, and translates them, verbatim, in the same order that Lactantius quotes them; In manus iniquas infidelium (nobis mendose fidelium) postea veniet, et dabunt Deo alapas manibus incestis, et impurato ore expuent venenatos sputos. Dabit vero ad verbera simpliciter sanctum dorsum, et colaphos accipiens tacebit; ne quis agnoscat quid verbum vel unde venit ut inferis loquatur, et corona spinea coronetur. Ad cibum autem fel, et ad sitim acetum dederunt, in hospitalitate (al. inhospitalitatis) hanc monstrabunt mensam. Ipsa enim insipiens gens tuum Deum non intellexisti ludentem mortalium mentibus; sed et spinis coronasti, et horridum fel miscuisti. Aug. de civit. Dei, l. 18. c. 23. [2. vol. VII. p. 506.] But besides these there is another verse, the last but two of the sixth book of these Sibylline Oracles, wherein they foretell the crucifixion of our Saviour, not cited by Lactantius, but by Sozomen, Tripart Hist. l. 2. c. 1. And it is thus:

῏Ω ξύλον ὦ μακαριστὸν ἐφ᾽ ᾧ Θεὸς ἐξετανύσθη·

which the same Sozomen, Hist. eccles. l. 2. c. 1. [vol. II. p. 45.] reads thus:

῏Ω ξύλον μακαριστὸν ἐφ᾽ οὗ Θεὸς ἐξετανύσθη.

it in history. Isaac was a type[y], the brazen serpent[z] a shadow of it. Isaiah was that prophesying evangelist, or evangelizing prophet, that expressly related his sufferings to come as if they had been already past, saying, *He is despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.* Isa. liii. 3. *He was oppressed, he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth*, ver. 7. But should I write down all the historical prophecies, or prophetical histories, concerning the passions of this *Immanuel*, *God-man*, I should transcribe not only all this chapter, but the greatest part of all the prophets. And as for the evangelists, though there be some things which only one of them relates, others which only two, others which three only have recorded; yet that he *suffered*, *was crucified*, *dead and buried*, they all with one consent left it on record, for the confirmation of our faith in so great a mystery. To pass by therefore his tender years, which he spent in subjection to his earthly parents, though themselves and all the world ought always to be subject unto him: if we take a turn in the garden of Gethsemane, or in the mount of Olives, the field, it seems, himself had appointed to fight the Devil and all his angels in, here we may behold a doleful sight, the Son of God beginning to be *sorrowful, and very heavy*, Matt. xxvi. 36. Mark xiv. 32. Luke

---

[y] Itaque in primis Isaac cum a patre hostia duceretur, et lignum ipse sibi portaret, Christi exitum jam tunc denotabat, in victimam concessi a Patre, lignum passionis suæ bajulantis. Tertul. adv. Judæos, [vol. II. c. 10.] In hoc tam grandi mystico fidei sacramento, et Abraham sanctus apparuit probatus, et filius in præsenti est liberatus in quo est Christus prænunciatus. Aug. de 4 virtutibus charitatis. [vol. V. App. ser. cvi. 7. p. 192.]

[z] Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ διὰ τοῦ Μωσέως τὸν χαλκοῦν ὄφιν ἐνήργησε γενέσθαι καὶ ἐπὶ σημεῖον ἔστησε, δι᾽ οὗ σημείου ἐσώζοντο οἱ ὀφιόδηκτοι· καὶ ἀναίτιός ἐστιν ἀδικίας. μυστήριον γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο, ὡς προέφην, ἐκήρυσσε, δι᾽ οὗ καταλύειν μὲν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ὄφεως, τοῦ καὶ τὴν παράβασιν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ γενέσθαι ἐργασαμένου, ἐκήρυσσε· σωτηρίαν δὲ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν διὰ τοῦ σημείου τούτου, τουτέστι τὸν σταυροῦσθαι μέλλοντα. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. [94.] Idem rursus Moyses post interdictam omnis rei similitudinem, cur æneum serpentem ligno impositum pendentis habitu in spectaculum Israeli salutare proposuit, eo tempore quo serpentibus post idololatriam exterminabantur? nisi quod hic dominicam crucem intentabat, qua serpens diabolus publicatur. Tertul. adv. Jud. [vol. II. c. 10.]

xxii. 39; presently saying to his disciples, Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, whom he had taken with him to behold the combat, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death*, Matt. xxvi. 38. Then leaving them he goes to his Father, pouring forth his mournful soul to him, having prostrated himself upon his face before him, crying out, *O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt*, ver. 39; and elsewhere, *Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour; but for this cause came I unto this hour*, John xii. 27. And if we view his body, behold sweat gushing out of it, *as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground*, Luke xxii. 44. And whilst his soul is thus surrounded with sorrows, his body is compassed about with enemies. Judas, his own disciple, betraying him; the soldiers apprehending him; the malicious Jews, resolved against their own salvation, hailing him from one place to another, spitting in his face, striking him with their hands, and crying out, *Crucify him, Crucify him.* And at the last, having by their importunity obtained his condemnation from Pilate, who then sat in judgment upon him, away they hurry him with his cross upon his shoulders, and a crown of thorns upon his head, unto the [a]place of execution; (himself all this while being forced by his almighty power to uphold them, whilst they thus abused him.) But for fear lest he being wearied by bearing of his cross himself should not endure so much pain when borne upon it, they afterward compelled one Simon, a Cyrenian, to carry it for him, not from compassion to him, but design against him; that coming fresh and lively to it, he might be the more able to grapple with the pains of death, and so they might have a longer time to glut their eyes with that pleasing object. Well, having gotten him to the place, they presently fasten the cross in the ground, and him upon the cross, stretching his joints till his sinews cracked, hanging a table over his head, wherein was written, *Jesus of Nazareth the king of the Jews.* And now was his *soul exceeding sorrowful unto death* indeed, when beholding himself so shamefully abused by his own, as well as his fellow-creatures, he cries out, *Eli, Eli, lama sabachtani, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Not intimating any spiritual desertion of his Father's affection towards him, but only a temporal desertion of his Father's protection of him against his enemies. As if he should have said, Why hast thou left me to be the object of so much cruelty? Which words he had no sooner spoken, but himself puts a period[b] to these his sufferings by *giving up the ghost*, and so dissolving the union betwixt his soul and body, though both his soul and body still remained [c]united to his sacred Deity. And, himself having breathed his soul from his body, Joseph of Arimathea obtained the favour to take his body from the cross, and laid it in a sepulchre, Luke xxiii. 53; and so he that *suffered, was crucified, dead*, was also *buried.* Thus have we seen our Saviour brought from the garden to the judgment-hall, from the judgment-hall unto the cross, and from the cross to the grave; and so he that came down from heaven is now himself laid under earth.

---

[a] This place the ancients took to be the same place where Adam was buried. Venit ad me traditio quædam talis, quod corpus Adæ primi hominis ibi sepultum est, ubi crucifixus est Christus; ut sicut in Adamo omnes moriuntur, sic in Christo omnes vivificentur; ut in loco illo qui dicitur Calvariæ locus, i.e. locus capitis, caput humani generis resurrectionem inveniat cum populo universo per resurrectionem Domini Salvatoris, qui ibi passus est, et resurrexit. Origen. in Mat. 27. Tract. 35. [vol. III. p. 920.] Quam suscepit in Golgotha Christus, ubi Adæ sepulchrum, ut illum mortuum in sua cruce resuscitaret; ubi ergo in Adam mors omnium, ibi in Christo omnium resurrectio. Ambros. lib. V. Epist. [LXXI. vol. II. p. 1070.] *Καὶ ὅτι μὲν οὐκ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐστιν ὁ παράδεισος, μαρτυρεῖ ὁ Ἀδὰμ ὁ ἐν τῷ κρανείῳ κείμενος.* Athanas. quest. ad Antioch. 47. [vol. II. p. 279.] And hence it is that some of them believed, that one of those that rose from their graves at the resurrection of our Saviour was Adam; of which tradition St. Augustine saith, Et de illo quidem primo homine patre generis humani quod eum ibidem solverit, ecclesia fere tota consentit, quod eam non inaniter credidisse credendum est, undecunque hoc traditum sit, etiamsi canonicarum scripturarum hinc expressa non proferatur autoritas. Epist. [clxiv. 6. vol. II. p. 575.]

---

[b] That it was himself that of his own accord gave up the ghost, and so laid down his life, appears from the strong cry he uttered even at his last gasp, *Eli, Eli, lama sabachtani,* for this plainly shews that he had sense and strength even to the last: as St. Chrysostome observes, *Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ φωνῇ ἐκραύγασεν, ἵνα δειχθῇ ὅτι κατ᾽ ἐξουσίαν τὸ πρᾶγμα γίνεται.* Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 88. [vol II. p. 540.] And this others also assent to; Nam spiritum cum verbo sponte dimisit. Tertul. Apolog. adv. gent. Quasi arbiter exeundi suscipiendique corporis, emisit spiritum non amisit. Ambros. [vol. II. p. 712.] de incarn. c. 5. [39.] Demonstravit spiritus mediatoris, quod nulla pœna peccati usque ad mortem carnis ejus accesserit, quia non eam deseruit invitus; sed quia voluit, cum voluit, et quomodo voluit. Aug. [vol. VIII. p. 820.] de Trinit. l. 4. [16.]

[c] Τὸ *μὲν σῶμα τῆς ψυχῆς διαζευχθῆναι, κατ᾽ οἰκονομίαν ἐποίησεν· ἡ δε ἀμέριστος θεότης ἅπαξ ἀνακραθεῖσα τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ, οὔτε τοῦ σώματος, οὔτε τῆς ψυχῆς ἀνεσπάσθη, ἀλλὰ μὲν μετὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν παραδείσῳ γίνεται διὰ τοῦ λῃστοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις τὴν εἴσοδον, διά δε τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς, ἀναιροῦσα τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου.* Greg. Nyssen. Epist. ad Eustath. [vol. III. p. 659.]

And that it was not for himself, but for us, that this God-man lived sorrowfully, and died so painfully, the scripture is full and clear; and not only in general that it was for our sakes he did it, but in particular, it was for the reconciling his Father to us, and to purchase the pardon of our sins for us, expressly telling us, that *he hath reconciled both* (Jew and Gentile) *unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby*, Eph. ii. 16. *Yea, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son*, Rom. v. 10. So that we, who *were sometimes alienated and enemies in* our *mind by wicked works, now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present* us *holy and unblamable and unreprovable in his sight*, Col. i. 21, 22. And the reason is, because *it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and* (*having made peace through the blood of his cross*) *by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.* ver. 19, 20. And this reconciliation of God to us he made by offering up himself a sacrifice for us: for *God sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins*, 1 John iv. 10. *And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world*, chap. ii. 2. And therefore, when we see him sweating great drops of blood under the burden of sin, we must not think they were his own sins that lay so heavy upon him: no, they were our sins which he had taken off from us, and laid them upon himself; for *he bore our griefs, and carried our sorrows: he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.* Isa. liii. 4, 5. So undoubted a truth is this comfortable assertion, that Jesus Christ by his death and sufferings reconciled his Father to us, and therefore was a sacrifice, *not only for original guilt, but* likewise *for actual sins of men.*

From scripture we may proceed to reason: for though that Jesus Christ did *truly suffer, was crucified, dead and* *buried*, it being a matter of fact, cannot be expected to be proved from reason; yet that he should truly *suffer*, be *crucified, dead and buried*, in order to his appeasing his Father's anger against us, and the purchasing his favour for us, may even from natural principles be clearly deduced. For in order to his [reconciling his] Father to us, we have seen how he must pay all our debts for us, whereof satisfaction to his justice for our transgressions of his law is one, which could not be paid in any other coin than by suffering; that being the debt we were engaged to pay to God for our sins against him. So that though Christ should have taken our nature upon him, if he had not suffered in it we should have reaped no benefit by it, it being suffering that we owe to God for sin, and therefore that Christ must pay to God for us. Neither must he only suffer, but suffer to death; for it was death that we had deserved by sin, and therefore it was death that Christ must undergo for us. *In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die the death*, saith the great God; and what he said then, being an unchangeable God, he cannot but always make true; so that we may as well expect God should cease to be God, as not make good his word, in punishing our disobedience with death. I say, with death, either in ourselves, or another person, whose death may be at the least equivalent with all ours. So that though Christ had suffered, yet if he had not died, the sufferings of his life could never have freed us from the pangs of death.

Neither was it only necessary that he should suffer and die, but that he should suffer this death upon the cross; for not only death, but a curse was entailed upon all transgressors of the law: *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them*, Deut. xxvii. 26. Gal. iii. 10. And therefore must Christ cut off the entail of curse as well as of death, in order to his instating us in perfect bliss; which he could not do any other ways than by being *made a curse for us*, willingly submitting to that death which was the only death cursed by God himself, and that was *the death of the cross: Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree*, Gal. iii. 13. Neither was he in reason only to hang upon the cross, but there to hang till dead;

otherwise he would not have suffered *the cursed death of the cross.* And that being once *dead* he was *buried*, it is plain; for his body, left by his soul, must needs have some place or other to lie in; and there, be it where it will, it may justly be said to be [d] buried.

And that he suffered these things not for himself but us, none that ever read the history of his life and death, and set his reason on work about it, but will easily grant it. Nay, he being both God and man, it is impossible he should suffer any thing for himself, himself having nothing to suffer for. For being God, though he might take our human infirmities, he could not possibly take our sinful imperfections into his sacred person; for then he that was God would have been a sinner as well as man; which to affirm is downright blasphemy, yea, and a contradiction too. So that we cannot but in reason judge him perfect and spotless without the least tincture of sin; and therefore we cannot but in reason also conclude that it was not for himself he suffered, it being impossible for the justice of God to inflict punishment upon any other account than sin; which he not having in himself, he could not have any punishment for himself, and therefore it must needs be for us he suffered, whose nature he had assumed. I say, for us, there being all the reason and justice in the world, that being it was our nature he suffered in, it should be our sins he should [suffer] for. Especially considering that it was not any human person in particular [e], but the human nature in general, he assumed into his divine person; so that as the whole nature sinned in Adam, so did the whole nature suffer for sin in Christ. And therefore there is none of us that take this Christ for our surety and believe these things, but, seeing we are all but particular persons comprehended under that general nature, we may justly expect our freedom from that punishment that we have already suffered in Christ. And as we may expect the pardon of our sins from his sufferings for them, so we may expect the reconciliation of God the Father to us; and the acceptance of our persons with him, upon the account of our nature in general being united and made one person with the divine. For here we may see how both natures are agreed, and the breach betwixt them so made up, as that they are both married together by the Spirit in the womb of the blessed Virgin, and ever since did, and ever shall live together, like loving mates, unto all eternity: and our nature being so nearly[f] joined together unto God as to make but one and the same person with him, we may well expect and believe that he will not refuse, but accept of any of the particular persons contained under his assumed nature, that by faith shall lay hold upon him, and by repentance turn unto him; especially, this being the great end of his first assumption of, and all his transactions in, the human nature: so that *he suffered, was crucified, dead and buried*, and all *to reconcile the Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but for actual sins of men*; that offering up himself a sacrifice for all our sins, he might reconcile the Father to our souls.

---

[d] The grave is commonly distinguished into the artificial and natural grave. The artificial grave is such a one as is digged in the earth, hewn out of stone, or any way prepared for the body of the dead. The natural is any place where the body lies: according to that of Seneca: Omnibus natura sepulturam dedit, naufragos idem fluctus qui expulit, sepelit, suffixorum corpora crucibus in sepulturam suam defluunt; eos qui vivi uruntur pœna funerat. L. 8. Controv. 4. [vol. III. p. 495.] And this is that which Mæcenas speaks of, Senec. Epist. 92. [vol. II. p. 434.] saying,

> Nec tumulum curo, sepelit natura relictos.

So that our Saviour might well be said to be *sepultus*, buried, howsoever or wheresoever his body, void of his soul, was laid. Sepultus intelligitur (saith Pliny) quoquo modo conditus, humatus vero humo contectus. Nat. Hist. l. 7. c. 54. And therefore though we can only know from scripture that Christ had an artificial grave, yet that he had a natural one reason itself may acquaint us.

[e] Item quæris utrum summa illa veritas et summa sapientia, forma verbum, per quam facta sunt omnia,

And this is the doctrine that the Fathers of the primitive church did constantly and unanimously teach. To begin with Ignatius[g]; "He truly ate and drank, was crucified and died

---

quem filium Dei unicum sacra nostra prophetantur, generaliter hominis an etiam uniuscujusque nostrum rationem contineat? Magna quæstio. Sed mihi videtur quod ad hominem faciendum attinet, hominis quidem tantum, non meam vel tuam ibi esse rationem. Aug. [vol. II. p. 18.] Epist. [14. 4.] ad Nebridium.

[f] Namque est in Patre, et factus est inter homines in hoc implet suam intercessionem quod omnes sibi univerit, et per seipsum Patri: sicut dicit Dominus in Evangelio ad Patrem verba faciens, *sicut tu Pater in me et ego in te, ut et ipsi unum sint in nobis*. Greg. Nyssen. in illud *Tunc ipse filius subjicietur*. [vol. II. p. 17.]

[g] Ἔφαγε καὶ ἔπιεν ἀληθῶς· ἐσταυ-

under Pontius Pilate: truly, I say, and not only in imagination, he was crucified and dead; the celestial, terrestrial, subterrestrial creatures all beholding him." And again[h]: "The Judge was judged by the false Jews and Pontius Pilate the governor; he was whipt, struck with the hand, spit upon; he was crowned with thorns, and clothed with purple; he was condemned and crucified truly, and not only in opinion, fancy, or deceit. He truly died, and was buried, and *rose again from the dead*. And elsewhere[i]: "Therefore he was truly born, and truly grew up, truly ate and drank, was truly crucified and dead, and rose again." And St. Hilary saith[k]: "But that the only-begotten Son of God was crucified and condemned to death, who by the nativity he had from his eternal Father was himself eternal, we often, yea, always preach. But this passion he is to be understood to be subject to, not from the necessity of nature, but rather from the mystery of the salvation of mankind, and that he rather willingly subjected himself to these sufferings than was forced by others."

And there were some in Athanasius's time also, as well as in Ignatius's, who affirmed that Christ did not, as we say, truly suffer, but that he suffered impassibly, in fancy and opinion only, not truly and really. Against these that renowned Father is very sharp and elegant: [l] "He suffered

---

ρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου· ἀληθῶς δὲ καὶ οὐ δοκήσει ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανε, βλεπόντων οὐρανίων, καὶ ἐπιγείων, καὶ καταχθονίων. Ignat. Epist. ad Trall. [p. 73.]

[h] Ὑπὸ τῶν ψευδοιουδαίων καὶ Πιλάτου τοῦ ἡγεμόνος ὁ κριτὴς ἐκρίθη, ἐμαστιγώθη, ἐπὶ κόρης ἐρραπίσθη, ἐνεπτύσθη, ἀκάνθινον στέφανον καὶ πορφυροῦν ἱμάτιον ἐφόρησε, κατεκρίθη, ἐσταυρώθη ἀληθῶς, οὐ δοκήσει, οὐ φαντασίᾳ, οὐκ ἀπάτῃ· ἀπέθανεν ἀληθῶς, καὶ ἐτάφη, καὶ ἠγέρθη ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. Ibid. [p. 76.]

[i] Ἀληθῶς οὖν ἐγεννήθη, ἀληθῶς ηὐξήθη, ἀληθῶς ἔφαγε καὶ ἔπιεν, ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη, καὶ ἀπέθανε, καὶ ἀνέστη. Id. ad Philad. [p. 174.]

[k] Quod autem et in crucem actum unigenitum Dei Filium, et morte damnatum eum qui ex nativitate quæ sibi ex æterno Patre est, naturalis et æternus sit, frequenter, imo semper prædicamus; non ex naturæ necessitate potius quam ex sacramento humanæ salutis passioni fuisse subditus intelligendus est, et voluisse magis se passioni subjici quam coactum. Hilar. in Ps. 53. Enar. [12.]

[l] Ἔπαθεν ἀπαθῶς. Ὢ τῆς ἀδιανοήτου σοφίας, ὢ τῆς παιζούσης διδασκαλίας, οἰκοδομούσης ἅμα καὶ καθαιρούσης. Οἷά ἐστιν ἰδεῖν τὰ τῶν παίδων ἐν ψάμμοις ἀθύρματα· ἔπαθεν ἀπαθῶς· πρὶν ἀκούω τοῦ ῥήματος ἐπιλανθάνομαι τῆς σημασίας τοῦ ἔπαθεν· ἐπαγόμενον γὰρ τὸ ἀπαθῶς, οὐκ ἐᾷ θάνατον καὶ ταφὴν καὶ ἀνάστησιν δέχεσθαι ἃ τὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἔχει σωτηρίας κεφάλαιον· εἰ γὰρ ἔπαθε, πῶς ἀπαθῶς; εἰ ἀπαθῶς, πῶς ἔπαθε; Athanas. πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας ἔπαθεν ἀπαθῶς Θεὸς λόγος. [vol. II. p. 568.]

impassibly! Oh foolish wisdom, Oh jocular learning, building up with one hand, and pulling down with the other, like childish sports in sand! He suffered impassibly! Before I can hear this word *impassibly*, I forget what *he suffered* signifies: for that which is added, *impassibly*, takes away both his death, burial, and resurrection, upon which our salvation depends. For if he suffered, how impassibly? or if impassibly, how did he suffer?" And again: [m] "Wherefore we must either acknowledge that our Saviour suffered truly, or that others also suffered impassibly, like to whom the Lord is preached to *have been tempted*." And again: [n] "We must therefore either believe that all things were true and real too; or, if we say that he suffered impassibly, we must of necessity say withal, that all things that are said of him are but figures, fancies, and imaginations. If he did not truly suffer, neither did he at all truly rise again. If he did not truly taste of death, neither did he pluck out the sting of death, *we are still in our sins, death still reigneth over all;* we are still kept out from our inheritance." And presently: [o] "But away with such madness, oh vain man! for the testator is dead, the will is settled, the inheritance is propounded to the faithful, and punishment prepared for such reproachers."

And that Christ did not suffer all this for himself, but for us, even to *reconcile the Father to us*, and to be a sacrifice for our sins: [p] "for he had his conversation," saith Ignatius, "without sin, and was truly crucified in the flesh, under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch, for us, by whom also we are redeemed by his divinely blessed passions. And

---

[m] Ὥστε ἢ καὶ τὸν σωτῆρα πεπονθέναι ἀληθῶς ὁμολογητέον, ἢ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀπαθῶς πεπονθέναι, ὧν καθ' ὁμοιότητα πεπειραμένος ὁ δεσπότης κηρύσσεται. Ibid. [p. 569.]

[n] Ἢ οὖν πάντα ἀληθῆ πιστευτέον, καὶ τὸ πάθος ἀληθινὸν ὁμολογητέον, ἢ τοῦ πάθους ἀπαθῶς γεγενῆσθαι λεγομένου σχῆμα ἀνάγκη καὶ δόκησιν καὶ φαντασίαν πάντα λογίζεσθαι. Εἰ οὐ πέπονθεν ἀληθῶς, οὐδὲ ἀνέστη πάντως ἀληθῶς· εἰ μὴ ὄντως ἐγεύσατο θανάτου, οὐδὲ τὰ κέντρα ἔσβεσε τοῦ θανάτου, ἔτι ἐσμὲν ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν· ἔτι βασιλεύσει πάντων ὁ θάνατος· ἔτι τῆς κληρονομίας ἀλλότριοι καθεστήκαμεν. Ibid. [p. 569.]

[o] Ἀλλ' ἄπαγε τῆς τοιαύτης παραπληξίας ὦ ἄνθρωπε, καὶ ὁ διαθέμενος γὰρ τέθνηκε, καὶ ἡ διαθήκη κεκύρωται, καὶ ἡ κληρονομία τοῖς πιστεύουσιν πρόκειται, καὶ ἡ τιμωρία τοῖς συκοφάνταις ἡτοίμασται. Ibid. [p. 569.]

[p] Πολιτευσάμενον ὁσίως ἀνεὺ ἁμαρτίας καὶ ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου [καὶ Ἡρώδου] τοῦ τετράρχου καθηλωμένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκὶ ἀληθῶς, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεομακαριστουπάθους. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. [p. 110.]

St. Hierome[q]: "He was wounded for our iniquities, saying, in the Psalms, *They pierced my hands and my feet*, that by his wounds he might cure ours. And he was bruised and made weak for our sins; that being made a curse for us, he might free us from the curse; for cursed is the man that hangeth upon a tree; wherefore the *chastisement of our peace was* also *upon him*. For that which we ought to have borne for our sins he underwent for us, reconciling by the blood of his cross the things that are in earth and that are in heaven; *for he is our peace, who hath made both one*." And so St. Cyprian[r]: "And *the Son of man goeth, as it is written of him*, who was himself condemned, that he might free those that were condemned: he grieved, that he might heal the weak: he feared, that he might make us secure: he bare reproaches, that the scoffs of reproachers might not move the elect." And this is that which [s] Athanasius also avers: "For the creature cannot be joined (nor so reconciled) to God by a creature, itself also wanting another to join it. Neither could part of the creation become the creature's salvation, seeing itself also wanteth salvation. Lest this therefore should come to pass, God sent his own Son, and he became the Son of man, assuming created flesh unto him, that seeing all were subject unto death, he being another from all offered his own body to death for all." And elsewhere[t]: "All things truly which our Lord and

---

[q] Ille vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras, dicens in Psalmo, *foderunt manus meas et pedes*, ut suo vulnere vulnera nostra curaret. Et attritus est sive infirmatus est propter scelera nostra, ut factus pro nobis maledictum nos liberaret a maledicto, *Maledictus autem homo qui pendet in ligno*. Unde *disciplina pacis nostræ super eum est*. Quod enim nos pro nostris debebamus sceleribus sustinere, ille pro nobis passus est, pacificans per sanguinem crucis suæ, sive quæ in terra sive quæ in cœlis sunt. Ipse enim est pax nostra qui fecit utraque unum. Hieronym. in Isa. 53. [vol. IV. p. 616.]

[r] Et quidem Filius hominis sicut scriptum est de illo vadet: qui damnatus est ut liberaret damnatos; doluit ut sanaret infirmos; timuit ut faceret securos; opprobria pertulit ut improperia detrahentium non moverent electos. Cyprian. de passione Domini. [p. 49. ad calc.]

[s] Οὐ γὰρ κτίσμα συνῆπτε τὰ κτίσματα τῷ Θεῷ, ζητοῦν καὶ αὐτὸ τὸν συνάπτοντα· οὐδὲ τὸ μέρος τῆς κτίσεως σωτηρία τῆς κτίσεως ἂν εἴη, δεόμενον καὶ αὐτὸ σωτηρίας· ἵνα οὖν μηδὲ τοῦτο γένηται, πέμπει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν, καὶ γίνεται υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου τὸν κτιστὴν σάρκα λαβών· ἵν᾽ ἐπειδὴ πάντες εἰσὶν ὑπεύθυνοι τῷ θανάτῳ, ἄλλος ὢν τῶν πάντων, αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ πάντων τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα τῷ θανάτῳ προσενέγκῃ. Athan. contra Arrian. orat. [ii. 69. vol. I. p. 536.]

[t] Πάντα μὲν ὅσα ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, καὶ σωτὴρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὡς ἔγραψεν ὁ Λουκᾶς, Πεποίηκέ τε καὶ ἐδίδαξεν εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν φανεὶς σωτηρίαν, διεπράξατο. Ibid. [ad episc. Ægyp. vol. I. p. 270.]

Saviour Jesus Christ, as St. Luke saith, *did and taught*, was done only and altogether for our salvation." And therefore, as St. Chrysostome saith, [u] "He died, that he might give immortality unto thee; he was hungry, that he might feed thee with his own flesh; he was thirsty, that he might give thee to drink of his own blood; he sat upon an ass, that he might set thee above the heavens; he was baptized, that he might set thee at liberty; he travelled, that thou mightest not be weary, and sailed that thou mightest not be fearful; he slept, to make thee secure; he came of a woman, that he might pity the sin that was committed in paradise; he was called a man, that he might call thee the son of God; he took our miseries, that he might give us his merits; and he prayed, that he might make thee believe." So that we may well conclude with Cyril of Alexandria [x]; "If any one say that he offered himself a sacrifice for himself, and not rather for us only, (for he needed no sacrifice who knew no sin,) let him be accursed." For fear of which curse, we dare not but acknowledge that Christ *truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.*

---

[u] Ἀπέθανεν οὖν ἵνα σοὶ ἀθανασίαν χαρίσηται· ἐπείνασεν ἵνα σὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χορτάσῃ σάρκα· ἐδίψησεν ἵνα σὲ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ αἷμα ποτίσῃ· ἐπὶ πώλου ἐκάθισεν ἵνα σὲ ὑπὲρ ἄνω τῶν οὐρανῶν καθίσῃ· ἐβαπτίσθη ἵνα σὲ ἐλευθερώσῃ· ὁδοιπόρησεν ἵνα σὲ ἀκάματον ποιήσῃ· ἔπλευσεν ἵνα σὲ ἄφοβον ποιήσῃ· ἐκοιμήθη ἵνα σὲ ἀμέριμνον ποιήσῃ· ἐκ γυναικὸς προῆλθεν ἵνα τὴν παράβασιν τὴν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ οἰκτειρήσῃ· ἐκλήθη ἄνθρωπος ἵνα σὲ υἱὸν Θεοῦ καλέσῃ· ἔλαβε τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὰ ἑαυτοῦ· ηὔξατο ἵνα σὲ πιστὸν ποιήσῃ. Chrys. εἰς τὸν τίμιον σταυρόν. [vol. VII. pp. 503, 4.]

[x] Εἴ τις λέγει καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ προσενεγκεῖν αὐτὸν τὴν προσφορὰν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ μόνων ἡμῶν (οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐδεήθη προσφορᾶς ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς ἁμαρτίαν) ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Cyril. Alex. Anath. 10. [Explan. xii. capitum; vol. VI. p. 155.]

ARTICLE III.

OF THE GOING DOWN OF CHRIST INTO HELL.

As Christ died for us, and was buried; so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell.

THOUGH this article be in itself as clear and certain as any of the rest, yet men having exercised their fancies so variously upon it, they have drawn, as it were, a veil over it, and so eclipsed the light of it. And hence it is that some do not rightly understand it, others scruple at it, yea, and others do in plain terms contradict and gainsay it. That the first of these may be taught the truth concerning it, the second resolved about it, and the third convinced of their error in denying it, I shall first lay down some propositions to clear it, and then proceed to the confirmation of it.

First, It will easily be granted that this article, as it is here delivered, was taken out of that which we commonly call the Apostles' Creed, it following and foregoing the same things here that it doth there. In the former article going before this it is said, he *suffered, was crucified, dead and buried.* In this, *he descended into hell.* In the next immediately coming after it, that *he arose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven.* And hence also that the meaning and purport of it must needs be the same in both places.

Secondly, I must confess that we cannot prove that this article was inserted in that Creed of almost 400 years after Christ, the Aquileian being the first particular church which is known to have inserted it in theirs: according to which [a] Ruffinus, being baptized into that church, framed his exposition of the Creed, with this article in it, but affirming that in his time (which was about the fourth century after Christ) it was neither in the [b] Roman nor in the Eastern creeds; which words of his some bring to prove the novelty of this article, but I think they are as great an argument for its antiquity as can be produced: for in that he saith it was not in the Roman nor Eastern creeds, he seems to me plainly to imply it was in some other creeds besides them. But suppose this article was never in any other before the Aquileian, this derogates nothing at all from the truth of it; for there are other articles of our faith that were never questioned, but always received as undoubted truths; as that of our Saviour's death, the communion of saints, God's being the maker of heaven and earth, all left out of the ancient creeds expounded by Ruffinus, Maximus, and Chrysologus, and many [c] others. Yea, and there is only one of them, viz. that of *God's being the maker of heaven and earth*, expressed in the Constantinopolitan. Now none can say, because that these are not inserted in these creeds they are no articles of our faith: especially it would be a groundless argument against this under hand, being though we cannot produce any certain proof of its being in the creed before the Aquileian church brought it in, yet it hath ever since been received as an undoubted truth for this 1200 years together. And I can see no reason why we, at the length, after so many centuries acknowledgment of it, should now bring it to the bar, and accuse it of forgery and usurpation.

---

[a] Nos tamen illum ordinem sequimur quem in Aquileiensi ecclesia, per lavacri gratiam suscepimus. Ruffin. in exposit. symboli. [p. 17.]

Thirdly, I must confess also that the words in the [d] Greek and [e] Latin creeds, which we translate *he descended into hell*, may admit of another interpretation than what in such a translation of them we put upon them. The word *hades* especially, which we translate *hell*, being often used to express the state of the dead in general, without any restriction or limitation of happiness or misery. In which sense in English we have no one word to give the full meaning or purport of it. Neither can I tell how to give a better periphrasis of it than by translating of it *the other world*, that invisible place where the souls that leave their bodies live, whether it be a place of bliss or torments. And in this sense I confess it is sometime taken [f] in scripture, the Apocrypha, Fathers, yea, and in

---

[b] Sciendum sane est quod in ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habetur additum, *descendit ad inferna*: sed neque in Orientis ecclesiis habetur hic sermo. Ibid. [p. 22.]

[c] As in those extant in Venantius Fortunatus, L. 11. in expos. symb. [p. 1227.] In Etherius and Beatus, 785 years after Christ. And the two Greek ones also, that of Marcellus, and the other written in the time of the English Saxons, excribed by the bishop of Armagh, in Diat. de eccles. Rom. symb. [p. 6.]

[d] In the Greek the words are, κατελθόντα εἰς ᾅδου (viz. τόπον) in the Apostles' Creed; κατελθὼν εἰς τὸν ᾅδην in Athanasius's, and κατῆλθεν ἐν ᾅδῃ, as it is in Horæ Beatæ Mariæ; or, as others, κατῆλθεν εἰς ᾅδου; and they all amount to the same thing; only in the ancient manuscripts in Bennet College library, cited by the reverend archbishop of Armagh, it is κατελθόντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα; and in the Confession of Sirmium, εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα, which more exactly answers the Latin.

[e] In the Latin it is, Descendit ad inferos; sometimes, Descendit ad inferna; sometimes, in inferna. Where we must look upon the *inferi* as the inhabitants of the *inferna*,

---

and *inferna* the habitations of the *inferi*. So that *descendit ad inferos* and *ad inferna* amount to the same thing too; for he could not descend *ad inferna*, but he must descend *ad inferos;* neither could he descend *ad inferos*, but he must descend *ad inferna*.

[f] Out of scripture, omitting some other places where it cannot well bear any other sense than this, I shall only produce two: the one out of the Old, the other out of the New Testament. That of the Old is, מי גבר יהיה ולא יראה מות ימלט נפשו מיד שאול, which the LXX. renders, *τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ ζήσεται, καὶ οὐκ ὄψεται θάνατον; ῥύσεται τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐκ χειρὸς ᾅδου*, Ps. lxxxix. 49. where the Hebrew שאול, and Greek *ᾅδης*, cannot possibly signify any more than the state of death; or, as the Targ. בית קבורתיה, "the house of the grave," it being here used in as large a sense as death itself. The place in the New Testament is, Καὶ *ὁ θάνατος καὶ ὁ ᾅδης ἔδωκεν τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς νεκροὺς*, *And death and hades gave up their dead*, Apoc. xx. 13. Syr. ܘܡܘܬܐ ܘܫܝܘܠ *And death and scheul*, (where we may note, by the way, how the Septuagint in the Old Testament render *scheul* by *hades;* and the Syriac, on the other hand, in the New, renders *hades* by *scheul;* so indifferently were these two words used for one another,) where *ᾅδης* again comprehends as many as *θάνατος*; and so it cannot signify here hell; for certainly that will never give up those that are in it. And so in the next verse it is said, Καὶ *ὁ θάνατος καὶ ὁ ᾅδης ἐβλήθησαν εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρὸς*, which certainly hell can never be. And as for the Apocrypha, there we read, Ὁ *ἐγείρας τὸν νεκρὸν ἐκ θανάτου καὶ ἐξ ᾅδου*, Ecclus. xlviii. 5; that is, as the Syriac renders it, ܕܐܚܝ ܡܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܫܝܘܠ, "who restored the dead from *scheul* to life;" where we may also observe how the Syriac renders both *θάνατος* and *ᾅδης* by one word ܫܝܘܠ. And so doth the Arabic too crowd them both into القبر, "the grave," plainly intimating that both words signify but one and the same thing: and in the same sense it is also taken plainly in other places of the Apocrypha, as Καὶ *ἡ ζωή μου ἦν σύνεγγυς ᾅδου κάτω*. Eccles. li. 9. And Τ*αχέως λέγων προπέμπειν εἰς ᾅδην*, 2 Macc. vi. 23. And in this sense did the Fathers also frequently use the word *ᾅδης* and *inferi*, as Τ*ῶν γὰρ ζωῆς ἐστερημένων νοοῖτ᾽ ἂν εἰκότως ὁ ᾅδης οἰκός τε καὶ ἐνδιαίτημα*. Cyril. Alex. in Gen. l. 6. [vol. I. p. 191.] Ἀ*λλὰ καὶ* Ἕ*λληνες, καὶ βάρβαροι, καὶ ποιηταὶ, καὶ φιλόσοφοι, καὶ πᾶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, συμφωνοῦσιν ἐν τούτοις ἡμῖν, εἰ καὶ μὴ ὁμοίως, καὶ φάσιν εἶναι τίνα δικαστήρια ἐν ᾅδου, οὕτω φανερὸν καὶ ὡμολογημένον τὸ πρᾶγμά ἐστι*. Chrysost. in 2 Cor. hom. 9. [vol. III. p. 600.] Τ*ί δὲ ὁ ᾅδης; οἱ μὲν αὐτὸν φάσι χῶρον ὑπόγειον σκότεινον, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμφανοῦς εἰς τὸ ἀφανὲς καὶ*

heathenish authors too. And as for the Latin *inferi*, it is often taken in the same sense, yea, and mostly used to express *hades* by.

Fourthly, Though therefore we cannot but acknowledge that the Greek word *hades* (and so the Latin *inferi*) may sometimes, both in scripture and other writings, signify no more than the receptacle of souls in general, as the grave is the receptacle of bodies; yet it cannot be denied but that it often, if not mostly, is used to express the receptacle of sinful souls in particular, or that which we in English call *hell*, the place of the damned. Especially when the Holy Ghost makes use of it to reveal the will of the great God by in the holy scriptures to us: and certainly it is the scriptural use of it which in the exposition of the Creed we are principally to attend unto. I shall here instance but in two or three places, wherein it cannot possibly be taken in any other sense; as, Luke xvi. 23. [g] *And in hades he lift up his eyes, being in tor-*

ἀειδὲς μετάστασιν τῆς ψυχῆς ᾅδην ἔφασαν, ἄχρι μὲν γὰρ ἐν σώματι ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ φαίνεται διὰ τῶν οἰκείων ἐνεργειῶν, μεταστᾶσα δὲ τοῦ σώματος ἀειδὴς γίνεται, τοῦτο γοῦν ἔφασαν εἶναι τὸν ᾅδην. Theophylact. in Luc. c. xvi. [p. 461.] Neque nostras animas derelinquet in inferno. Origen. in Matt. 27. tract. 35. [vol. III. p. 926.] Nonne inferna Christo testimonium perhibuerunt, quando jure suo perdito Lazarum quem dissolvendum acceperant integrum per quatriduum reservaverunt, ut incolumem redderent cum vocem Domini sui jubentis audirent? Aug. [vol. VIII. App. p. 18.] Orat. contra Judæos, Paganos et Arrianos, c. 17. To these we may also add those ancient verses, made as it is thought about the emperor Commodus's time, called the Sibylline Oracles, where in the first book there is given this account of ᾅδης.

. . . . . . τοὺς δ' αὖ ὑπεδέξατο ᾅδης
Ἅιδην δ' αὖτε κάλεσσαν ἐπεὶ πρῶτος μόλεν Ἀδὰμ
Γευσάμενος θανάτου, γαία δὲ μὲν ἀμφεκάλυψε
Τούνεκα δὴ πάντες οἱ ἐπιχθόνιοι γεγαῶτες
Ἀνέρες εἰς Ἀΐδαο δόμους ἰέναι καλέονται. [p. 7.]

To these we may also add the ancient poets themselves, who often took the word ᾅδης to signify the other world in general, even in as large a sense as *θάνατος*, for which it seems often to be used, as Pindar. Isthm. Od. 6. [vol. I. p. 630.]

Τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς εὔχεται
Ἀντιάσας ἀΐδαν γῆ-
ράς τε δέξασθαι πολιὸν
ὁ Κλεονίκου παῖς. ——

Sophocles in his Ajax,—

Κρείσσων γὰρ ᾄδᾳ κεύθων ἢ νοσῶν μάταν, [635.]

Homer. Il. 1. [init.]

Πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς ἄϊδι προΐαψεν.

Theognis in his Elegies, v. 425.

Πάντων μὲν μὴ φῦναι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον,
Μηδ' ἐσιδεῖν αὐγὰς ὀξέος ἠελίου,
Φῦντα δ' ὅπως ὤκιστα πύλας ἀΐδαο περῆσαι,
Καὶ κεῖσθαι πολλὴν γῆν ἐπαμησάμενον.

[g] Gr. Καὶ ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων ἐν βασάνοις, which the Syriac expressly renders, ܘܒܫܝܘܠ: ܡܫܬܢܩ ܒܫܘܢܩܐ,

ments; where we may see how the Holy Ghost himself, to satisfy our scruples in this particular, is his own interpreter, plainly telling us that when he was in hades he was in torments. And in the next verse he tells Abraham he was *tormented in those flames*. So Matt. xi. 23. [h] *And thou Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be brought down to hades;* where we see heaven and hades opposed to one another, the height of happiness unto the depth of misery. And here also the Holy Ghost seems to point at the sense he would have us to understand the word in, saying in the next verse, *It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee:* as if he should say, Sodom shall rather escape being thrown into hell and the place of torments, than thou, who hast the light but wilt not walk according to it. To name no more, Matt. xvi. 18. [i] *The gates of hades shall not prevail against thee;* where *hades* cannot be taken for any thing else than the place where the devils remain and are tormented: as if he should have said[k], All the devils in hell shall never prevail against my church. There are some other places wherein this word occurs, but these may suffice to clear this truth, that the Holy Ghost doth frequently, if not always, use this word *hades* in a bad sense, to denote the place of torments and everlasting misery. And in this sense also did the Fathers of the primitive church usually take the word. Thus

---

And when he was tormented in scheul, (and here we may also observe how the Syriac ܫܝܘܠ, and the Ethiopic ሲኦል, *Siol,* both taken from the Hebrew שאול, are both used in this place to denote a place of torments,) *he lift up his eyes.* And the Arabic in plain terms, when he was

فِي ٱلجحيم *in Gehenna,* in hell.

And St. Augustine notes, Inferorum mentionem non esse factam in requie pauperis sed supplicio divitis. De Gen. ad lit. l. 12. c. [63. vol. III. p. 321.]

[h] In the Greek it is Καὶ σὺ Καπερναοὺν ἡ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθεῖσα ἕως ᾅδου καταβιβασθήσῃ· where both the Arabic renders ᾅδοι by الجحيم, and the Ethiopic by ገሀነም *Gehenna,* which cannot signify any thing else but hell.

[i] Καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς· where the Arabic renders it again by الجحيم, *Gehenna,* the Syriac by ܫܝܘܠ, the Ethiopic by ሲኦል *Siol.*

[k] Καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ ἀσάλευτος ἡ ὑπόσχεσις, καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀήττητος, κᾂν ὁ ᾅδης αὐτὸς κινηθῇ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτῷ κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους. Athanas. orat. ὅτι εἷς ἔστι Χριστός. [vol. II. p. 51.] *Portæ inferorum.* Sic vocat potentiam et machinas Satanæ quibus ecclesiam et petram ejus foris et intus perpetuo impugnabit. Par. in l.

Theodoret commends the ancient philosophers, in that they sent the souls of them that lived well and virtuously to heaven[l], but such as lived otherwise to hades. And what St. Augustine's opinion concerning the word was is clear from the etymology he giveth of it, saying, it is called *hades*[m] because there is nothing sweet there; and therefore he must needs account it a place of great bitterness and torments indeed. And elsewhere the same Father tells us, that [n] *inferi* (which always answers the Greek *hades*) in scripture is seldom or never taken in a good part, to signify heaven, but always hell. And St. Hierome saith[o], it is a place of punishments and torments.

Fifthly, Though the word *hades* in itself may sometimes signify only the other world in general, yet, as it stands in the Creed, it cannot by any means admit of any other signification than what is put upon it when it is translated *hell:* which any one may easily perceive which considers, first, that the word may well bear it; secondly, that it is the most usual signification of it in scripture, as I have shewed in some places already, and might with the same facility prove it to be so taken in most of the rest. And certainly, the Creed being taken out of the scripture, it is the scripture that is to give the exposition of the Creed: and therefore this word in particular must needs be granted to signify the same in the Creed, which was taken out of the scripture, as it doth in the scripture out of which it was taken. Especially considering, thirdly, that the general acception of the word, as it denotes the other world, cannot without a great absurdity be forced upon it as it is here used to express an article of the Creed: for it will easily be granted, that in so short an [p] abstract of our Christian faith it is not likely the same thing should be expressed twice over. Which notwithstanding must be, if the words which we translate *he descended into hell* should signify no more than he descended or went into the other world; for that was sufficiently expressed before, when it was said that he was dead. For though death and hades be not the same, yet to be dead and to be in hades are the same thing: for in that sense a man cannot be dead but he must be in hades, neither can a man be in hades but he must be dead. And upon the same account it is that it cannot be admitted that this article should be the same with that of his burial, *that he descended into hell* and he *was buried* should be the same, interpreting the word *hades* of the grave. For besides that hades is one thing, and the grave another, the grave being the receptacle of the bodies, and hades of the [q] souls, here would be the same thing expressed twice; yea, and the latter expression of it would not be [r] exegetical and declarative of the former, but the former would rather be exegetical and declarative of the latter; which how absurd and ridiculous it would be, let any man judge; especially considering that his burial and descent into hell, as signifying two distinct things, seem both necessary to be inserted into the Creed, so that we might know whither both his soul and his body went immediately after his death and crucifixion: his body, that was buried; and his soul, that went down to hell: so was he both buried and went down into hell.

---

[l] Κάτω δ' εἰς ᾅδου τὰς τ' ἐναντία προελομένας. Theod. de fine et judicio, Serm. xi. [vol. IV. p. 654.]

[m] Unde et in Græca lingua origo nominis (viz. *hades*) quo appellantur inferi, ex eo quod nihil suave habeant resonare perhibetur. August. de Gen. ad literam, l. 12. c. [66. vol. III. p. 322.] viz. from α privat. *and* ἥδυς, *sweet, pleasant;* or, as Eustathius, the ancient scholiast on Homer, Ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ ἥδου φάσι παραχθῆναι τὸν ᾅδην κατ' ἀντίφρασιν ᾧ ἥδεται καὶ χαίρει οὐδεὶς, in Homer. Iliad. 1. [vol. I. p. 37.]

[n] Non enim facile alicubi scripturarum inferorum nomen positum invenitur in bono. August. de præsentia Dei ad Dardanum, [ep. 187. 6. vol. II. p. 679.] Quid his ergo præstiterit qui dolores solvit inferni, in quibus illi non fuerunt, nondum intelligo; præsertim quia ne ipsos quidem inferos uspiam scripturarum locis in bono appellatos potui reperire. Id. epist. [164. 7. p. 575.] ad Euodium. Quanquam et illud me nondum invenisse confiteor, inferos appellatos ubi justorum animæ requiescunt. Id. de Genesi ad liter. l. 12. c. [63. vol. III. p. 320.] Proinde ut dixi nondum inveni et adhuc quæro, nec mihi occurrit inferos alicubi in bono posuisse scripturam duntaxat canonicam. Ibid. [64.]

[o] Infernus locus suppliciorum atque cruciatuum est, in quo videtur Dives purpuratus; ad quem descendit et Dominus, ut vinctos de carcere dimitteret. Hieron. [vol. IV. p. 250.] in Isa. c. 14. Thus also saith Justin Martyr, (or whosoever was the author of the quæst. et respon. ad orthodox.) Αἱ δὲ τῶν ἀδίκων ψυχαὶ εἰς τοὺς ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ τόπους. Quæst. 75. [p. 470.]

---

[p] Non est verisimile irrepere potuisse superfluam ejusmodi battologiam, in compendium hoc ubi summatim quam fieri potest paucissimis verbis præcipua fidei capita notantur, saith Calvin himself, concerning the absurdity of their opinion who would make *κατελθόντα εἰς ᾅδου* to be the same with *ταφέντα*. Calvin. Instit. l. 2. c. 16. sect. 8. [vol. IX. p. 132.]

[q] *Θάνατος μὲν χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, ᾅδης δὲ τόπος ἡμῖν ἀειδὴς ἤγουν ἀφανὴς καὶ ἄγνωστος, ὅ τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν ἐντεῦθεν ἐκδημούσας δεχόμενος.* Andr. Cæsar. in Apoc. Comment. cap. 64. [p. 97.] Comperies aliquod esse inferni et mortis discrimen, quod animas infernus detineat, mors vero corpora, nam immortales sunt animæ. Theophyl. 1 Cor. xv. [v. 55. p. 313.]

[r] Quantæ enim oscitantiæ fuisset rem minime difficilem verbis expeditis et claris demonstratam, obscuriore deinde verborum complexu indicare magis quam declarare? Nam quoties locutiones duæ rem eandem exprimentes simul connectuntur, posteriorem esse prioris exegesin convenit. At vero qualis erit ista exegesis, si quis ita loquatur, quod Christus sepultus esse dicitur, significat ad inferos descendisse? Calv. Instit. l. 2. c. 16. sect. 8. [p. 132.]

But lastly, Howsoever such an interpretation may be forced upon this article as it stands in the Apostles' Creed, yet we are sure there can be no such sense put upon it as it is here delivered as the doctrine of the Church of England. For though the Greek word *hades* may sometimes signify no more than the other, or invisible world, where souls after separation from their bodies remain, yet our English word *hell* will bear no such sense, it being always used by learned and ignorant to denote the place of misery and torments prepared for such souls as go from hence in their sins. And therefore the reverend Convocation that composed these Articles, rendering the Greek *hades* by the English *hell*, (as it was always used in our English creeds,) they have put a period to the question; so that we must either acknowledge that Christ did in plain terms descend into hell, or deny this article of our church; to the truth whereof, notwithstanding, all that are admitted into benefices are bound by act of parliament to subscribe: and certainly, if we weigh it thoroughly in the balance of unbiassed reason, we shall find nothing in it to deter us from subscribing to it, and that in its literal sense and meaning, which I suppose is no more than this: that our Lord Christ, the Son of God, having taken our human nature upon him, had a real soul as we have, as well as body; which soul being breathed from his body upon the cross did immediately go to hell, or the place of torments, where the Devil and damned souls lay in misery: that as his body went to the grave, so did his soul go to hell. The end of his descent is not expressed in these Articles, whether to triumph over the devils, or to preach to the souls of men, or any other, (as it was in the

[s] Articles agreed upon in the year 1552): but only in general, that he descended into hell; which that he did, I can see no other but that scripture and reason do both evince.

Many scriptures have been brought for the proof of this truth; some whereof were of sufficient force to convince gainsayers of it in ancient times, which are not of the same validity now; as that in Peter, *Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison*, 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19. Which place many of [t] the ancients interpreted of the descent of Christ into hell, or the place of damned spirits. Which interpretation was so generally received in the primitive church, that they did not for a great while seek out for any other, but took this to be the undoubted meaning of the place; so that to name the place to them was a sufficient proof of the thing. But another exposition universally possessing men's hearts now, the argument is rendered now altogether useless and invalid for the purpose aforesaid. Though I do confess, that was a man resolved to hold it, that this place is to be understood of the soul or spirit of Christ's real descent into hell, I know no reasons strong enough to draw him from his error in it. I am sure the ancient [u] Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic translations seem clearly to carry the sense that way.

---

[s] The Articles composed an. Dom. 1552, being the fourth of king Edward VI. expressed it thus: Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit, spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus qui in carcere sive in inferno detinebantur, fuit, illisque prædicavit, ut testatur Petri locus, &c.

[t] For otherwise they would not have held that Christ preached there, as it is plain they did; as Origen, *Κἂν μὴ βούληται τοῦτο φαμὲν ὅτι καὶ ἐν σώματι ὢν οὐκ ὀλίγους ἔπεισεν, καὶ τοσούτους ὡς διὰ πλῆθος τῶν πειθομένων ἐπιβουλευθῆναι αὐτόν· καὶ γυμνῇ σώματος γενόμενος ψυχῇ ταῖς γυμναῖς σωμάτων ὡμίλει ψυχαῖς, ἐπιστρέφων κἀκείνων τὰς βουλομένας πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἢ ἃς ἑώρα δι' οὓς ᾔδει αὐτὸς λόγους ἐπιτηδειοτέρας*, l. 2. contra Celsum. [43. vol. I. p. 419.] Cyril of Alexandria: Quod spiritibus in inferno prædicatum abierit, et detentis in domo custodiæ apparuerit Christus, et omnibus vinculis liberaverit, in Isai. l. 3. c. 42. [vol. II. p. 539.] Irenæus; Ea propter Dominum in ea quæ sunt sub terra descendisse, evangelizantem, et illis adventum suum remissam peccatorum existentem his qui credunt in eum. Iren. advers. hæres. l. 4. c. [27. 2. p. 264.] And Clemens Alexandrinus: *Εἰ γ' οὖν ὁ Κύριος δι' οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἰς ᾅδου κατῆλθεν ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίσασθαι.* Stromat. l. 6. [vi. p. 763.] And they had no other place of scripture to ground this their opinion upon, which clearly shews that they did interpret this place of his descent; v. et Job. de incarn. Verb. l. 9. c. 38. [p. 638. Photii Myriob.]; et Œcum. [vol. II. p. 514.] in loc.

There is another place also that seems to have been an argument for this truth in the primitive church, that hath lost much of its virtue now; and that is this, Acts ii. 24, where it is said of Christ, *Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it:* where, instead of *the pains of death*, some of the [x] ancient Fathers read *the pains of hell*, or *hades*, (Vulgar Latin, *inferni;*) and so doth the Syriac render it plainly, the [y] sorrows of *scheul*, or hell. And truly, was I deprived of the original Greek, and confined to a translation of the New Testament, I should choose the Syriac above all the rest, it being (as may easily be demonstrated) the first translation that was ever made of it; and therefore, in all probability, made before the malice of heretics or the negligence of transcribers had brought any various readings into it. And for my part, the Syriac in this place rendering the Greek word by *scheul*, I cannot but persuade myself the word in Greek, when this translation was made, was nothing else but *hades*, there being no other word it renders by *scheul* but only that. Especially many of the Fathers seeming to have read it so too; yea, St. Augustine produceth this place to prove that Christ descended into hell; as we may see in our quotations of him at the end of this article and in the [z] margent.

---

[u] The Syriac renders the latter end of the 18th verse, ܘܡܝܬ ܒܦܓܪ ܘܚܝܐ ܒܪܘܚ "And he died in the body, but lived in the spirit;" that is, his body indeed was dead, but his soul or spirit was yet alive. And then in the next verse, ܘܐܟܪܙ ܠܢܦܫܬܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܚܝܕܢ ܗܘܝ ܒܫܝܘܠ, "And he preached to the souls that were detained in hell;" that is, as the words manifestly import, though his body was dead, yet his soul or spirit being alive, in that he went and preached in hell. For here we can by no means understand his spirit of the Holy Ghost, by which he preached in the days of Noah; he not being said to have preached by the spirit by which he was quickened, but simply he went and preached. The Arabic more clearly; "He was dead in the flesh, but lived in the spirit," الذي به ذهب, in which he betook himself, or went to the spirits in prison, and preached; plainly implying, that the spirit, in which he lived after his body was dead, in that he went to hell, and preached. And the Ethiopic translation, though it doth render *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι* by በመንፈስ፡ ቅዱስ፡ *in Spiritu Sancto*, yet it doth not say that it was in this that he went down to hell; but only in general, that he that was put to death in the flesh and quickened in the Spirit went to the souls shut up in hell, and preached to them. He did not go in the Holy Spirit, but himself went in his own spirit. So that these ancient translations seem clearly to import that he did indeed go to hell.

[x] The words in Syriac are ܘܫܪܐ ܚܒܠܘܗ ܕܫܝܘܠ "and he loosed the sorrows, or pains of scheul;" because he could not be detained ܒܗ ܒܫܝܘܠ "in hell."

[y] Thus Polycarp read it: *Ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου.* Or, as it is in the Latin translation, Quem resuscitavit Deus dissolvens dolores inferni. Polycarp. epist. ad Philip. [p. 14.] And Irenæus, Quem Deus resuscitavit solutis doloribus inferorum. Iren. adv. hæres. l. 3. c. 12. [2.] So that two of the most ancient Christian writers that we have, plainly read it so. And if we descend down into after-ages we shall find St. Augustine [vol. II.] never quoting the place, but still read it so too; as: In quibus etiam hoc est quod apud inferos fuit, solutisque eorum doloribus quibus eum erat impossibile detineri. Epist. [164. 14.] Unde beatus Petrus eum dicit solvisse dolores inferni, in quibus impossibile erat detineri eum. Id. epist. [187. 6.] Quomdo enim aliter accipiendum sit quod dictum

But there are some places which ever were and ever will be clear proofs of this truth. As, first, Eph. iv. 9, *Now that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth. He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things:* where *the lower parts of the earth*, to which Christ descended, I cannot see how they can be otherwise interpreted than of hell. For to say by the lower parts of the earth is meant no more than earth itself, to me it seems but a poor evasion. For where in scripture do we find the lower parts of earth put for earth itself? Or suppose it was so, yet here his ascending and his descending have reference to one another. So

---

est, Quem Deus suscitavit ex mortuis solutis doloribus inferorum. Id. de Genesi ad literam, l. 12. c. 33. [63. vol. III. par. i. p. 321.] And so, wheresoever else he quotes the place; and so others too, as Epiphanius in Anchor. et hæres. 69. Fulgent. l. 3. ad Thrasimund.: and hence it is, that in some Greek copies, particularly in that of Stephanus, printed an. 1550, ᾅδου is put into the margent, as a different reading from θανάτου, it being in some, as well as θανάτου in other copies.

[z] Et Christi quidem animam venisse usque ad ea loca in quibus peccatores cruciantur, ut eos solveret a tormentis quos esse solvendos occulta nobis sua justitia judicabat, non immerito creditur. Quomodo enim aliter accipiendum sit quod dictum est, Quem deus suscitavit ex mortuis solutis doloribus inferorum, quia non poterat teneri ab iis, non video, nisi ut quorundam dolores apud inferos eum solvisse accipiamus ea potestate qua dominus est, cui omne genu flectitur cælestium terrestrium et infernorum, per quam potestatem etiam illis doloribus quos solvit non potuit teneri. Aug. de Genesi ad literam, l. 12. c. 33. [63. vol. III. par. i. pp. 320, 321.]

that the apostle seems clearly to intend the descent which immediately preceded his ascent into heaven, which could be no other than his descent into hell. It was many years after his descending to earth before his ascending to heaven; but his ascent into heaven was not much more than so many hours after his descent into the lower parts of earth, or hell[a]. Neither can we think that by the lower parts of earth here we must understand his grave, for that is seldom six foot deep in the earth, and therefore cannot well be called the lower parts of it. But again, here we see not only his ascending and his descending opposed to one another, but the lower parts of earth to the highest parts of heaven. So that we are to look out for the extremes that are the most distant from and contrary to one another in heaven and earth, the highest place in heaven and the lowest place in earth. The highest place in heaven, what is it but the right hand of God, whither Christ ascended? The lower parts of earth, what is it but hell, whither Christ descended?

Another place upon which we may build this truth is Rom. x. 6. *But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ from above:) or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring Christ up again from the dead.)* In which words we may observe, first, that Christ was among the dead; otherwise it could not be said, *that is, to bring him from the dead.* Secondly, as he was amongst the dead, so it was a deep place, otherwise it could not be said, *Who shall descend into the deep?* Nay, thirdly, it was such a deep as the Greeks call *an abyss*, a bottomless pit, by which name hell is called, Apoc. ix. 1, 2; xi. 7; xx. 1, 3. And I know not where the Greek word can well be otherwise interpreted; howsoever not here, and therefore doth the Syriac give us the explication as well as the translation of the word, rendering it *the deep*, or [b] *abyss of hell.* And therefore also do many, both ancient and modern [c] writers, expound and interpret the words in this sense; and whosoever goes after them will not have many rubs in his way to stop his course.

---

[a] And thus doth the Ethiopic translation seem clearly to carry the sense, rendering the words, ወምንትኑ፡ ዘዐረገ፡ ሶበ፡ ሊወረደ፡ ምትሐት፡ ምድር፡ "Et quid est quod ascendit, nisi quod descendit infra terram; When he came from heaven to earth, he did not descend under the earth, but only to the top of it." So that by these words ምትሐት፡ ምድር፡ *mytyhata mydr, Under the earth,* we cannot probably understand any thing but hell, the only place generally thought to be under earth. Nay, and this was the sense of the Fathers too upon the place. Inferiora autem terræ Infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit. Hieron. in loc. [vol. VII. p. 613.] Nay and Irenæus brings this place, amongst others, to prove that Christ conti-

But, thirdly and lastly, the main foundation of this truth is still behind, and that is, Psalm xvi. 10. compared with Acts ii. 31. David saith, *For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine holy One to see corruption.* These words doth St. Peter in the Acts apply to our Saviour, chap. ii. 27 and 31, saying, that David *seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption:* which to understand aright, we must consider how St. Peter is here handling the great point of the resurrection and ascension of the Lord Christ. And in treating of the resurrection, to satisfy all scruples that might arise upon his delivery of so great a mystery, he tells us from whence both the essential parts of his human nature arose, or were raised up: his soul, that was raised out of hell, and his body from the grave: for, saith he, *His soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption.* His soul went indeed to hell, but it was not left there: his body was carried to the grave, but it did not see corruption there. And so there is no place can be a clearer proof of any, than this is of this truth, that the soul of Christ, when separated from his body, was in hell. For if it was not left there, but raised

---

nued for a while amongst the dead, or in hell, before his resurrection: Nunc autem, saith he, tribus diebus conversatus est ubi erant mortui, quemadmodum prophetia ait de eo, Commemoratus est Dominus sanctorum mortuorum suorum eorum qui ante dormierunt in terram stipulationis, et descendit ad eos extrahere eos et salvare eos, et ipse quidem dominus, Quemadmodum ait Jonas in ventre cœti tres dies et tres noctes mansit, sic erit filius hominis in corde terræ. Sed et apostolus ait, Ascendit autem quid est nisi quia et descendit in inferiora terræ? Hoc et David in eum prophetans dixit, Eripuisti animam meam ex inferno inferiori. Iren. adv. hæres. l. 5. c. ult. [c. xxxi. pp. 330, 331.]

[b] ܘܡܢܘ, ܢܚܬ ܠܬܗܘܡܐ ܕܫܝܘܠ *And who hath descended into the abyss of hell?* Rom. x. 7. Syr.

[c] V. Theophyl. [p. 108.] et Bucer, [p. 416.] in loc.

thence at his resurrection, certainly it was there before his resurrection; it being impossible it should be raised thence if it was never there. It is certain therefore that the soul of Christ was in hell before his resurrection, and as certain it was not there before his death and crucifixion. For before that time his soul was in his body, and both on earth; and therefore it cannot be otherwise understood than that after he was crucified and dead, his body was carried to the grave, and his soul to hell: yet so as that the one was not left in hell, neither did the other see corruption in the grave; for within three days after they were both raised up again, the one from hell, and the other from the grave, as St. Peter in this his sermon declares, and the immediately succeeding article asserts.

But as there is no truth but hath been oppugned, so there is no place of scripture but hath been eluded; yea this very place which in itself is as clear as the meridian sun, hath been obscured by false glosses; some labouring much to persuade us, that the word here translated *soul* signifies no more than a *body*, or his *person*; and the word translated *hell*, no more than the *grave*. But let such consider, first, whether it be not a certain rule always to be followed in the interpretation of scripture, to expound every word in its most usual and common signification, if the place will as well bear it, rather than force an unusual sense upon it? I confess the word [d]*nephesh* in Hebrew may sometimes signify no more than a body without a soul, sometimes both soul and body in one person; but where there is one place where it is taken in that sense, there are at the least twenty wherein it signifies no more than the soul. And because it sometimes signifies the body, must we always translate it so? This is just as if because [e]*berech* in some few places signifies *to curse*, we should always translate it so. But again, grant the word may signify no more than the body, here it cannot be taken in that sense, for his body is after expressed by another word plainly signifying flesh. *His soul was not left in hell*, saith the apostle, *neither did his flesh see corruption*. Where it is plain that the word used for his soul, and that for his body, denote two several things. Again, we cannot take this, but we must take the other word *hades* in its unusual sense too: for as *nephesh* doth but rarely signify the body, but most commonly the soul; so doth *hades* most commonly denote the receptacle of souls, but very rarely, if ever, the receptacle of our bodies. And what a ridiculous thing is it to force such far-fetched significations upon words, when the literal sense is not dissonant from, but consonant

---

[d] The word which the Psalmist useth is נפש, that which the apostle expresseth it by is ψυχὴ, and it cannot be denied but that they both in scripture may sometimes very properly be translated a body, yea, a carcass, sometimes a person consisting both of body and soul: as for the first, that it sometimes signifies a body, or carcass, we may see in those words, ושרט לנפש לא תתנו בבשרכם, *You shall not make any cutting in your flesh for the dead*, as we render it, Lev. xix. 28, where the Greek also renders נפש by ψυχὴ, *καὶ ἐντομίδας οὐ ποιήσετε ἐπὶ ψυχῇ ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν*, i. e. as Onkelos hath it in his Paraphrase, or Targum, וחבול על מית לא תתנון בבסרכון, et læsionem super mortuum non facietis in carne vestra. So that נפש is rendered by מית in Onkelos, and by נפש דמית in Jonathan's Targum. And so the Arabic, على ميت "for the dead." And indeed the sense will not bear any other signification: so ועל כל נפשת מת לא יבא, Gr. Καὶ *ἐπὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ τετελευτηκυίᾳ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται*, Lev. xxi. 11, that is, as our translation hath it; "neither shall he go in to any dead body." And so in the first verse of the same chapter, לנפש לא יטמא בעמיו. Græc. *ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς οὐ μιανθήσονται ἐν τῷ ἔθνει αὐτῶν*: where נפש

Onkelos renders by מית, "the dead;" Jonathan by בר נש דמית, "the man that is dead:" the Syr. ܢܦܫܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ, "the soul that is dead," and the Arabic also by ميت, "the dead." So it is taken also, Num. v. 2. vi. 6, 11. Hag. ii. 14: and it is sometimes also put for the whole man, as ונכרתה הנפש ההיא מעמיה, Gr. *ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς*, Gen. xvii. 14: that is, as Onkelos renders it, אנשא ההוא, and Jonathan, בר כשא ההוא, "that man, or that person, shall be cut off from his people." So also Gen. xii. 5. c. xlvi. 26. and elsewhere. And this the word signifies, either by a synecdoche partis, the part being put for the whole, as Anselmus Laudunensis, Lyranus, and others think; or by a metonymy, whereby the thing contained is put for the thing that doth contain it; as St. Augustine, Animæ nomine corpus solum posse significari modo quodam locutionis ostenditur, quo significatur illud quod continetur per illud quod continet. August. Epist. ad Optat. [190. 19. vol. II. p. 705.]

[e] That ברך doth sometimes signify to curse, as well as to bless, is plain; for it is said, *And Job said, It may be my sons have sinned,* וברכו אלהים בלבבם, that is, as we render it, *and cursed God in their hearts,* Job i. 5. Syr. ܘܓܕܦܘ ܠܐܠܗܐ. And the Arabic, وشتموا الله, i. e. "And cursed, reproached, or spoke evil against God;" Gr. *κακὰ ἐνενόησαν πρὸς Θεόν*. Chald. וארגיזו קדם יי, *And provoked God to anger*. And it cannot but be taken so in this place, even for cursing rather than for blessing, this being a duty, not a sin; whereas it is a sin, not a duty, which the word is here used to express. And in this sense also is it used, Job i. 10. ii. 5, 9. 1 Reg. xxi. 10, 13.

to all the other scriptures? Certainly this is to turn the word of God all into allegories, synecdoches, and other tropes and figures. Lastly, it is not unworthy our observation, that it was the same St. Luke that wrote the Gospel who also wrote the Acts of the Apostles; and it is not very probable that he would use the word *hades* to signify the place of torments in his Gospel, Luke xvi, and I know not in what sense here in the Acts. And they that would put this sense upon the words must pretend to a far greater knowledge and skill in the interpretation of the scripture, than most or all the Fathers of the primitive church had, who generally translated and expounded the words in a common and usual sense, *That his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption.* And therefore we cannot but acknowledge, that though this doctrine be not verbally contained in the scripture, yet it may, by necessary consequences, be deduced from it; and so cannot but be received as one of those great truths which the most high God hath been pleased to make known to us in his holy scriptures.

From scripture, if we proceed to reason, we may argue thus. The soul of Christ, after its separation from the body, and before his resurrection from the dead, was either in heaven or in hell; but it was not in heaven, therefore it must needs have been in hell. First, that it was in one of these two places I take for granted, being now reasoning against such as rightly deny all third places whatsoever appointed for the reception of souls when forced from their bodies, distinct from those two. And as for *limbus patrum*, purgatory, and the like, we shall prove hereafter that they are human fancies, rather than divine truths. But the great question here to be agitated is, whether Christ's soul, when breathed from his body, went to heaven or no? For certainly, if it did not go to heaven, we need no more arguments to prove it went to hell, there being no other place it could go to. Therefore, secondly, that the soul of Christ when separated from his body did not immediately go up to heaven, I think will easily be granted by such as do but seriously, and without prejudice, consider these things: First, that the Lord Christ, both while living and when dying, was still accounted as a sinner;

though he had no sin inherent in him, or committed by him, yet he had sin imputed to him, and laid upon him; yea, so far, as that he is in plain terms said to be *made sin for us*, as well as *we are made the righteousness of God in him.* And hence it is, that bearing the weight (though not doing the work) he received *the wages of sin, death.* And he thus dying as a sinner cannot in reason be thought to go whither saints, but whither sinners go when dead. His body, that was laid where the bodies of sinners are, in the grave; and so his soul, it is fitting that should go whither the souls of sinners go, to hell; and that he that died for sin should go to the same place whither such go as die in it. Not to be tormented there as sinners are, because he had not committed sins here as sinners had; but only he having taken our nature upon him, and satisfied for our sins in his death and passion; and it being three days before his soul and body, when once separated, were to be united together again, he suffered his body to be laid so long under the earth; in the meanwhile his soul, that went down to hell, and there remained all that time, not to be tormented, for he had already suffered for us whatsoever the law of God could exact of us; but, first, that he might undergo the state and condition of a dead, as well as of a living [f]sinner; and so, secondly, that he might give us security for our pardon and redemption from hell. For, seeing he was even in the Devil's mouth, yet that roaring lion could not prey upon him; seeing he was in hell itself, yet could be kept there no longer than just as himself pleased; we may be assured he had conquered and overcome the Devil for himself, and in himself for us, who are but as so many members of himself; and thus by his descending thither he hath [g]freed us for ever coming thither, or remaining there. But, thirdly, his soul, I suppose, did principally go to hell, and remained there whilst his body was in the grave, that so it might be in a state of humiliation, as well and as long as his body. His body was brought to the lowest place it could possibly be brought to, even to the grave; and so was his soul brought too to the lowest place it could possibly be brought unto, even to hell.

---

[f] Impleta est scriptura, quæ dicit, Et cum iniquis reputatus est, quod et altius intelligi potest, dicente de semetipso Domino, reputatus sum cum descendentibus in lacum, factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio inter mortuos liber, vere enim reputatus est inter peccatores et iniquos ut descenderit ad infernum. Hieron. in Isa. liii. 12. [vol. IV. p. 624.] And this is one of the reasons that Fulgentius gives of his descent, even that he might go where sinners after death used to go, and so be in the condition of a dead, as well as living sinner. Restabat ad plenum nostræ redemptionis effectum, ut illuc usque homo sine peccato a Deo susceptus descenderet, quousque homo separatus a Deo peccati merito cecidisset, i. e. ad infernum, ubi solebat peccatoris anima torqueri, et ad sepulchrum ubi consueverat peccatoris caro corrumpi; sic tamen, ut nec Christi caro in sepulchro corrumperetur, nec inferni doloribus anima torqueretur. Fulgent. ad Thrasimund. l. 3. [c. xxx.]

And this leads me to the second reason why we are not to think that the soul of Christ went not to heaven but to hell; because, if his soul had ascended to heaven, as his body descended into the grave, then one part of his human nature had been exalted, whilst the other had been debased. For his soul, that would have been shining in the highest heavens, whilst his body was lying under a piece of earth; and so this would have been in a state of humiliation, whilst the other was in its state of exaltation. By which means, at that time he would have been wholly in neither state, but partly in both. And so most of the systems of divinity that ever were made, teaching only a double state of Christ, the one of his humiliation, the other of his exaltation, must be changed, and a third state added, partly of exaltation, partly of humiliation. But that needs not, for certainly Christ was never in more than one state at one time: when he was in a state of humiliation he was in a state of humiliation, not of exaltation; when in a state of exaltation he was in a state of exaltation, not of humiliation. In one of which estates he purchased salvation for us, in the other he applies it to us. And therefore there can be no need of making a mixed estate, unless it be to build the error upon it, that Christ went not to hell, but heaven. And therefore, until it can be proved that there is more necessity than that of holding a mixed estate of Christ, wherein part of him for a time was exalted, and part of him debased, (which I believe can never be,) we cannot but maintain that the soul was in a state of humiliation, as well and as long as the body, and so not in heaven when this was upon earth, but under earth in hell, whilst his body was under earth in the grave. And when one rose they both rose; the soul being fetcht from hell to be united again to its body. But in few words, to put this question out of question, that the soul of Christ was not in heaven, (but therefore in hell,) in the third place, our Saviour himself, who best knows when he first ascended up to heaven, tells us plainly, the third day after his death, being the day of resurrection, that he was not then ascended up to heaven, saying to Mary, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father*, John xx. 17. Which certainly cannot be meant only of his body, but of his soul also, or rather both soul and body together. For if either of them, especially if his soul had been ascended to his Father, I cannot see how he could have said, *I am not yet ascended to my Father*, for the soul is the principal part whence the whole is denominated; and so, whatsoever the soul doth, the whole person is looked upon as doing: as when our souls go to heaven, we are said to go thither. And therefore might Christ, if his soul had been then in heaven, better have said, I am now descended from my Father, than *I am not yet ascended to my Father;* for he had ascended and come down again. But we cannot, we dare not, but believe, that Christ meant really as he spake, that he then was not ascended to his Father, that the human nature which he assumed upon earth was not as yet gone up to heaven, but one part of it had been in hell, the other in the grave; and being both joined together again, the whole human nature appeared visibly to Mary after his resurrection, as it had done before his passion. Whence we cannot but judge, that if we weigh things in the equal balance of unbiassed reason, we must needs believe that the soul of Christ, when breathed from his body upon his cross on earth, went not up to his crown in heaven, but stayed in hell until the time that it was to be tied to its body again, that as both had been all along together in a state of humiliation upon earth, so both might go together to his estate of exaltation in heaven.

---

[g] Hoc autem ideo factum est, ut per morientem corporaliter carnem justi, donaretur vita æterna carni, et per descendentem ad infernum animam justi, dolores solverentur inferni. Fulgent. [Ibid.] ad Thrasimund. l. 3. *Πάσχων γὰρ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνέλαβε, καὶ πεινῶν αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἔτρεφε, καὶ εἰς τὸν ᾅδην καταβαίνων ἡμᾶς ἀνέφερε.* Athanas. [vol. I. p. 104.] *εἰς τὸ πάντα μοὶ παραδόθη*, &c. Quia ideo ille pervenit usque ad infernum ne nos remaneremus in inferno. Aug. in Psa. lxxxv. [17. vol. IV. p. 912.] And how he can be said to free us from hell, or remaining there, who never were there, the same Father, in the same place tells us: Quemadmodum si medicus videat tibi imminentem ægritudinem, forte ex aliquo labore, et dicit, parce tibi, sic te tracta, requiesce, hisce cibis utere, nam si non feceris ægrotabis; tu autem si feceris salvus eris, recte dicis medico liberasti me ab ægritudine, non in qua jam eras, sed in qua futurus eras. Nescio quis habens causam molestam, mittendus erat in carcerem, venit alius, defendit eum, gratias agens quid dicit? Eruisti animam meam de carcere; suspendendus erat debitor, solutum est pro eo, liberatus dicitur de suspendio. In his omnibus non erant; sed quia talibus meritis agebantur ut nisi subventum esset ibi essent: inde se recte dicunt liberari, quo per liberatores non sunt permissi perduci. Ibid. [18. p. 913.]

And if from producing arguments for this truth we go on to consider such as have been produced against it, we shall not find any thing very material. Indeed there is scarce any thing that looks like an argument against it: only there are two scriptures, and but two only, that they make use of to batter it; and they are, first, the words of our Saviour to the thief, *Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise*, Luke xxiii. 43. But surely they were much busied that had not leisure to consider what it is to be with Christ in paradise, and so, what our Saviour meant when he promised the thief he should be that day with him in paradise; certainly he did not promise him that he should be with his soul, or with his body, but with his Deity[h]. It is that that maketh paradise to be paradise; and if the thief had been that day with his soul, without his Godhead, or the enjoyment of the Divine nature, he could not be said to be in paradise. So that to be with Christ in paradise is plainly no more than to be in heaven; for he that is in heaven must needs be with Christ in paradise, and he that is with Christ in paradise must needs be in heaven. And so I believe was Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob with Christ in paradise before his birth and incarnation; and so might the thief be immediately after his death and passion. For though his human nature was not there, yet his Divine nature was; and so the very same person that was at that time with the thief upon the cross was there, though the nature he had assumed into that person was not; and that certainly was all our Saviour did; more than which he could not promise to the thief when he said, that *that day he should be with him in paradise.*

---

[h] Est autem sensus multo expeditior et ab his omnibus ambiguitatibus liber, si non secundum id quod homo erat, sed secundum id quod Deus erat dixisse accipiatur, *hodie mecum eris in paradiso*. Homo quippe Christus illo die secundum carnem in sepulchro, secundum animam in inferno futurus erat; Deus vero idem ipse, Christus ubique semper est. Aug. epist. [187. 7. vol. II. p. 680.] ad Dardan. de præsentia Dei. Sicut ergo potuit recte dici Dominus gloriæ crucifixus, cum ad solam carnem illa passio pertineret; ita recte dici potuit, *hodie mecum eris in paradiso*, cum juxta humanam humilitatem per carnem in sepulchro, per animam in inferno illo die futurus esset, juxta divinam vero immutabilitatem nunquam de paradiso, quia ubique est semper, recessisset. Ibid. [9.] Qui enim homini pœnaliter pendenti et salubriter confitenti ait: Hodie mecum eris in paradiso, secundum id quod homo erat, anima ejus ipso die futura fuerat in inferno, caro in sepulchro; secundum autem id quod deus erat, utique et in paradiso erat. Et ideo latronis anima a pristinis fascinoribus absoluta et illius munere jam beata, quamvis ubique sicut ille esse non poterat, tamen etiam ipso die cum illo in paradiso poterat, unde ille qui ubique semper est non recesserat. Id. in Joh. tract. 111. [2. vol. III. par. ii. pp. 780, 781.]

The other place is that of St. Luke, where our Saviour, as he was giving up the ghost, crieth out, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,* Luke xxiii. 46. From hence they argue, that the spirit of Christ being committed into the hands of God, it must needs go to heaven. But I wonder whether the hands of God could not reach into hell as well as heaven: *If I make my bed in hell,* saith David, *behold, thou art there,* Psalm cxxxix. 8. And why might not the spirit of Christ be commended into the hands of God, though it should go to hell, as well as if it should have gone to heaven? May we not commit our bodies into the hands of God, which perhaps may lie many years rotting in their graves, as well as our souls, that go immediately to him? Nay, certainly, seeing Christ went to hell, he may well be thought to have more need to commend his spirit into the hands of God, that he might protect and defend it in the midst of so many devils and hellish fiends. So that when our Saviour Christ saith, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,* what is it more than this, Father, seeing my spirit is now going from earth to hell, I commend it into thy hands, that thou mayest preserve it in hell as thou hast on earth? And so these words, instead of fighting against us, seem to be clearly on our side; and these two places failing, I know not of any other that can be brought to enervate this truth, that *Christ descended into hell.*

Neither is this a truth of yesterday's growth, but almost all the Fathers of the primitive church have acknowledged and received it as an article of their faith. Though they much differ about the end of his going, yet that he did go thither they all agree. Some said he went to preach, others to loose whom himself thought fit, others to triumph over his conquered enemy the Devil, but all affirm that he did go to hell. But passing by many others, I shall only pack one jury of them that bring in their verdict for this truth.

And the foreman is Ignatius[i], who saith expressly, "He descended into hell alone, but ascended with a multitude."

The next is Clemens Alexandrinus, whose opinion was not only that he descended, but that he descended on purpose to preach to the spirits there detained, saying, [k]"The Lord therefore descended for no other end, but only to preach the gospel, either to all, or else to the Jews only;" and adds[l], "That at that time things were so ordered in hell, that all the souls that there heard the preaching, might either manifest their repentance, or acknowledge their punishment to be just, because they did not believe."

The next is Tertullian, who saith[m], "The God Christ, being also a man, and dying according to the scriptures, and being buried also according to the same, he satisfied this law also undergoing the manner of an human death in hell."

The fourth is famous Athanasius[n], who tells us, "Christ was buried; his soul, that went to hell, but seeing it could not be held there, it was restored to his body, and so he rose again."

---

[i] Καὶ κατῆλθεν εἰς ᾅδην μόνος, ἀνῆλθε δὲ μετὰ πλήθους. Ignat. Epist. ad Trallianos, [p. 74.]

[k] Εἰ γ᾽ οὖν ὁ Κύριος δι᾽ οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἰς ᾅδου κατῆλθεν, ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ὥσπερ κατῆλθεν ἤτοι πάντας εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ἢ μόνους Ἑβραίους. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 6. [6. pp. 763, 4.]

[l] Οὐχὶ καὶ ἐν ᾅδου ἡ αὐτὴ γέγονεν οἰκονομία, ἵνα κἀκεῖ πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ ἀκούσασαι τοῦ κηρύγματος τὴν μετάνοιαν ἐνδείξωνται, ἢ τὴν κόλασιν δικαίαν εἶναι δι᾽ ὧν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν ὁμολογήσωσι. Ibid. [p. 765.]

[m] Christus Deus quia et homo mortuus secundum scripturas, et sepultus secus easdem, huic quoque legi satisfecit forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus. Tertul. de anima, c. 55.

[n] Τάφῃ παρεδόθη, γέγονεν ἡ ψυχὴ κατὰ τὸν ᾅδην, καὶ κρατηθῆναι μὴ δυνηθεῖσα πάλιν ἀπεδόθη τῷ σώματι, καὶ γέγονεν ἡ ἀνάστασις. Athanas. de duabus in Christo naturis, [vol. II. p. 567.]

The fifth is St. Hilary[o], who saith, "It is the law of human necessity that their bodies being buried, their souls should descend to hell; which descent the Lord did not refuse for the consummation of a real man, viz. that he might do for man whatsoever man was bound of necessity to do."

The sixth is St. Ambrose[p]; "Though the soul of Christ was in the abyss of hell, yet now it is not, because it is written, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.*"

The seventh is St. Basil, who upon those words, *But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave,* (or from the hand of hell, as this Father translates it,) *for he shall receive me,* saith[q], "He clearly foretelleth the descent of the Lord into hell; who shall redeem this prophet's soul with others that it may not remain there."

The eighth is St. Hierome, who saith[r], "Hell is a place of punishments and of torments, where the rich man that was used to be clothed in purple was seen: whither also the Lord descended, that he might loose those from prison that were bound there." And again[s]: "For none is delivered from hell but only by the grace of Christ, and therefore did Christ descend thither after his death. As the angel descended into the furnace at Babylon to deliver the three children, so did Christ descend into the furnace of hell, where the souls of the just were shut up."

---

[o] Humanæ ista lex necessitatis est, ut sepultis corporibus ad inferos animæ descendant, quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit. Hilar. Enar. in Psal. cxxxviii. [22. p. 514.]

[p] Ipsa anima Christi etsi fuit in abysso, jam non est, quia scriptum est, *non derelinques animam meam in inferno.* Ambros. de incarn. c. 5. [42. vol. II. p. 713.]

[q] Πλὴν ὁ Θεὸς λυτρώσεται τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐκ χειρὸς ᾅδου, ὅταν λαμβάνῃ με. Σαφῶς προφητεύει τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου κάθοδον τὴν εἰς ᾅδου, ὃς μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ αὐτοῦ λυτρώσεται τοῦ προφήτου τὴν ψυχὴν ὡς μὴ ἐναπομεῖναι ἐκεῖ. Basil. in Psal. xlviii. al. xlix. [vol. I. p. 247.]

[r] Infernus locus suppliciorum atque cruciatuum est, in quo videtur Dives purpuratus, ad quem descendit et Dominus, ut vinctos de carcere dimitteret. Hieron. in Isa. c. xiv. [vol. IV. p. 250.]

[s] Nemo enim ab inferni sedibus liberatur, nisi per Christi gratiam. Eo igitur post mortem Christus descendit. Ut angelus in caminum Babylonis ad tres pueros liberandos descendit, ita Christus ad fornacem descendit inferni, in quo clausæ justorum animæ tenebantur. Id. in Ecclesiast.

The ninth is Macarius, who lived before the five last cited; and in his disputation in the first general council of Nice affirmed[t], "After death we are carried into hell. This also did he (Christ) take upon himself, and descended willingly into it. He was not detained there as we are, but he descended."

The tenth is Fulgentius, who thus delivereth his opinion in this particular[u]: "But the humanity of the Son of God was neither wholly in the grave nor wholly in hell, but as to his real flesh, Christ being dead lay in the grave, but in his soul Christ descended into hell, and in the same soul returned from hell again to the flesh he had left in the grave."

The eleventh is Anastasius Sinaita[x], who avers the selfsame thing with him: "The grave truly received his body only, but hell his soul only."

The twelfth and last is St. Augustine, who, though in time he was before the two last named, shall bring in his verdict after them: and his opinion is[y], "That if those words, *This day shalt thou be with me in paradise*, be spoken of the humanity which the Word of God assumed, paradise is not there to be thought to be in heaven. For the man Christ was not that day to be in heaven, but in hell as to his soul, and in the grave as to his body." And again[z]: "And that the

---

[t] *Κατεφερόμεθα μετὰ τὸν θάνατον εἰς τὸν ᾅδην· ἀνεδέξατο καὶ τοῦτο, καὶ κατῆλθεν ἑκουσίως εἰς αὐτόν· οὐ κατηνέχθη καθάπερ ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ κατῆλθεν.* Macar. Hier. apud Gelas. Cyzicen. in Act. conc. Nicæn. l. i. [p. 157.]

[u] Humanitas vero Filii Dei nec tota in sepulchro fuit, nec tota in inferno; sed in sepulchro, secundum veram carnem Christus mortuus jacuit, et secundum animam ad infernum Christus descendit, et secundum eandem animam ab inferno ad carnem quam in sepulchro reliquerat, rediit. Fulgent. ad Thrasimund. l. 3. [p. 140.]

[x] Ὁ *μὲν τάφος αὐτοῦ σῶμα μόνον ὑπεδέξατο, ψυχὴν δὲ μόνην ὁ ᾅδης.* Anastas. Sinait. apud Euthym. Panopl.

[y] Si ergo secundum hominem quem Verbum Deus suscepit, putamus dictum esse, *hodie mecum eris in paradiso*, non ex his verbis in cœlo existimandus est esse paradisus. Neque enim ipso die in cœlo futurus erat homo Christus; sed in inferno secundum animam, in sepulchro autem secundum carnem. Aug. Epist. ad Dardanum, [187. 5. vol. II. p. 679.]

[z] Et Dominum quidem carne mortificatum advenisse in infernum satis constat; neque enim contradici potest vel prophetiæ quæ dixit, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in inferno*, quod ne aliter quisquam sapere auderet, in Actibus Apostolorum idem Petrus exponit, vel ejusdem Petri illis verbis quibus eum asserit solvisse *inferni dolores in quibus impossibile erat eum teneri.* Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos Christum. Id. Epist. ad Euodium, [164. 3. p. 574.]

Lord being put to death in the flesh came to hell is clear; for none can contradict either that prophecy that saith, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*, which lest any one should understand otherwise, the same Peter expoundeth in the Acts of the Apostles; nor those words of the same Peter, whereby he asserteth, that he *loosed the pains of hell*, of which it was impossible he should be held. Who therefore but an infidel can deny that Christ was in hell?" And that it ought to be received as one of the principal articles of our faith, the same Father teacheth us, saying, [a] "Wherefore let us hold firmly what faith hath received upon the surest grounds, that Christ died, according to the scriptures, and was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the same; and the other things that are written of him, the truth being witness; of which also this is one, that he was in hell, having loosed the pains thereof, whereby it was impossible he should be held.

Seeing therefore that scripture is so clear for it, seeing reason also subscribeth to it, seeing so little or nothing can be brought against it, seeing a whole jury of Fathers, besides others, give in their verdict for it, we cannot but conclude, that *as Christ died for us, and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell.*

---

[a] Quamobrem teneamus firmissime quod fides habet fundatissima autoritate firmata, quia Christus mortuus est secundum scripturas, et quia sepultus est, et quia resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas, et cætera quæ de illo testante veritate conscripta sunt. In quibus etiam hoc est, quod apud inferos fuit, *solutis eorum doloribus quibus eum erat impossibile teneri.* Ibid. [14. p. 578.]

ARTICLE IV.

OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature.

WHEN the Son of God had assumed our human nature into his Divine Person, our nature so assumed did not always remain in one and the same condition: but there was a double state we are to believe it to have been in; the one of humiliation, the other of exaltation: in both of which likewise there were several degrees. In his state of humiliation he was debased, 1, as low as death itself, yea, the death of the cross. Nay, 2, lower than that, even to the grave. Nay, 3, lower still than either of them, even unto hell itself. And so also in his state of exaltation there are the same steps; for he was exalted, 1, so high, as to rise from the dead. Nay, 2, higher than that, to ascend up to heaven. Nay, 3, highest of all, to sit at the right hand of God. His estate of humiliation, with its several degrees, we have already considered; having in the second article shewn how he was *crucified, dead and buried;* and in the third, how he *descended into hell.* In this we have the three degrees of his exaltation, his resurrection, ascension, and sitting at the right hand of God. Of which in their order, as they are here placed. And first therefore of his resurrection: Christ did truly rise from death. As he did truly suffer, was truly crucified, truly dead, truly buried, and did truly descend into hell; so did he also truly rise again from death. The soul of Christ, being breathed from his body, went down to hell; the body of Christ, being deprived of its soul, was carried to the grave. And here they both continued, the one in the grave, and the other in hell, until the third day after the divorce was made: at which time the soul, that went from the body down to hell, comes up again from hell unto the body. And, as it left the body upon the cross, it now finds it in the grave; even the selfsame body that three days before was nailed to the cross; not any way broken, bemangled, or corrupted, but in the same condition the soul had left it in. This selfsame body, which the soul before was forced from, is it now again united to. After which union of the soul to the body, immediately follows the return, or resurrection both of soul and body from the state of death. The separation of the soul from the body had brought (though not the soul, yet) the human nature into a state of death; the union of the soul to the body brings it back again into a state of life. So that Christ after his resurrection, as well as before his passion, had all things appertaining to the human nature; having the same soul and the same [a] body, the same flesh and the same bones that he had before, and the same of every thing that belongeth to the perfection of man's nature. So that whatsoever is essential to the constitution of the human nature, without which he could not be man as well as God, that was the Lord Christ invested with after his resurrection, as well as before his passion.

Christ from his birth to his death, from the first moment wherein he was conceived by the Holy Ghost until the last wherein himself gave up the ghost, was a real living man; having not only a soul and body as we have, but a soul united to his body as ours are. But when his soul was separated from his body, for the time he was not a living but a dead man, the union of the two essential parts being as necessary to the making up of a living man, as the parts themselves are to the making up of a man. Whereas, though the soul and body of Christ retained their personal union to the Son of God after his death and before his resurrection, as well as after his birth and before his passion, yet in the meanwhile they were separated from one another: one of them was not united to the other, though they were both united to the Divine Person. And therefore as we, when our souls are in heaven or hell, and our bodies in the grave, are not for the present living men, so neither was Christ. He had indeed at that time both parts of the human nature united to him, but yet he had them not united together, but one in one place, and the other in another; but now, when the time appointed comes, these the parts of the human nature, which for a while had been divorced, are joined together again, and so do constitute a perfect living man as they had done before: and being the same parts, they cannot but make the same man too. And this is that which we are to understand when we say Christ rose from the dead, even that the soul and body which Christ assumed being separated from one another, the third day after, they were united again. And so the man Christ is now alive, who before was dead; so alive as to walk up and down the earth, and to discourse with his disciples as he had done before: and that he did thus rise again from death, scripture is express and reason clear.

---

[a] Caro enim Christi, quamvis gloria resurrectionis fuerit magnificata, et potenter super omnes cœlos ascensione glorificata, eadem tamen carnis mansit et manet natura quæ assumpta est de Maria. Ipse enim est qui conceptus et genitus, atque a mortuis suscitatus est per gloriam Patris. Aug. [vol. VI. App. p. 251.] Serm. de assumpt. Mariæ virg.

And in producing of scriptures for this great fundamental truth, I shall first confirm it from the prophecies of the Old, and then from the histories of the New Testament. The Law foretold the Messiah should, the Gospel relates how Christ did really rise from death. First, from the Old Testament. And verily had we all the scriptures our Saviour himself made use of, when *beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself*, Luke xxiv. 27, or those whereby St. Paul persuaded his hearers, *both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening*, Acts xxviii. 23, certainly we should be richly furnished with convincing arguments for this truth. But in the meanwhile let these two or three convince us of it, and confirm us in it. As, first, *My flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption*, Psalm xvi. 9, 10. That these words were spoken prophetically of Christ is clear, because the same Spirit that here speaks them in the Psalmist David, applies them to Christ by the apostle Peter, Acts ii. 31. And if the soul of Christ must not be left in hell, nor his flesh see corruption, they must of necessity rise again; for otherwise the one could not but be left in hell, nor the other but see corruption in the grave. Another place is that, *When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days*, Isa. liii. 10. Where the first words plainly imply his offering up himself a sacrifice upon the cross for sin, and the latter his rising from the dead, without which it would be impossible for him after that to prolong his days. Thus it is said also, that *of the increase of his government there shall be no end*, Isaiah ix. 7; which notwithstanding, if he should not rise again, would be determined in his death.

And what was foretold in the Old concerning the Messiah, is recorded in the New Testament concerning this Jesus, that he was indeed raised from the dead, telling us, that *though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God*, 2 Cor. xiii. 4. And again, *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of dead and living*, Rom. xiv. 9. *Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more*, ch. vi. 9. But besides these and the like places, that expressly assert this truth, we have in the gospel the testimonies of several eyewitnesses recorded, that saw him as really alive after his death as they had done before. As, 1. Mary Magdalene saw him at the sepulchre, presently after he was risen, Mark xvi. 9. John xx. 14. 2. Cleopas and another of the disciples enjoyed his company and his discourse as they were going to Emmaus, Luke xxiv. 13, 14; Mark xvi. 12. And again, 3. All the eleven disciples being met the same day, (Thomas excepted, who then was absent,) saw him standing amongst them, heard him speaking unto them, and breathing the Spirit upon them, John xx. 19. And, 4. above five hundred brethren had the happiness to behold him at the same time, 1 Cor. xv. 6. And, 5, after that, James saw him by himself, ver. 7. 6. After that, he was seen of all the apostles, Thomas being present with them, John xx. 26; 1 Cor. xv. 7; at which time Thomas, having not seen him before, mistrusted and doubted whether it was he or no, which our Saviour knowing presently convinced him of his error, saying to him, [b] *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing,* John xx. 27; which Thomas doing was forced immediately to cry out, *My Lord and my*

---

[b] Our Saviour bidding Thomas here to behold his hands and side, and Luke xxiv. 39. his feet, several of the Fathers thence gathered, that the prints, scars, and marks of the wounds he received upon the cross, remained after his resurrection; these being all the places wherein the wounds were made. His hands and feet were pierced through with the nails that fastened him to the cross, and his side with a spear by one of the soldiers; whence St. Augustine, Clavi enim manus fixerant, lancea latus ejus aperuerat, ubi ad dubitantium corda servanda vulnerum sunt servata vestigia. In Joh. tract. 121. [4. vol. III. par. ii. p. 808.] Sciat sane qui has proposuit quæstiones, Christum post resurrectionem cicatrices non vulnera demonstrasse dubitantibus; propter quos etiam cibum et potum sumere voluit, non semel sed sæpius ne illud non corpus sed Spiritum esse arbitrarentur: et sibi non solide sed imaginaliter apparere. Tunc autem illæ falsæ cicatrices fuissent si nulla vulnera præcessissent, et tamen nec ipsæ essent si eas esse noluisset. Voluit autem certæ dispensationis gratia, ut eis quos ædificabat in fide non ficta non aliud pro alio, sed hoc quod crucifixum viderant, resurrexisse monstraret. Id. Epist. ad Deo gratias, [102. 7. vol. II. p. 275.] Terruerunt eos vulnera firmaverunt cicatrices. Posset Dominus Jesus Christus sine ulla cicatrice resurgere. Quid enim illi potestati magnum erat ad tantam integritatem compagem corporis revocare, ut nullum omnino vestigium præteriti vulneris appareret? Habebat potestatem ut illud etiam sine cicatrice sanaret; sed habere voluit unde nutantes columnas firmaret. Id. in Ps. lxxiv. [7. vol. IV. p. 787.] Si ergo Dominus legem mortuorum servavit, ut fieret primogenitus a mortuis, et commoratus usque ad tertiam diem in inferioribus terræ, post deinde surgens in carne ut etiam figuras clavorum ostenderet discipulis sic ascendit ad patrem. Iren. advers. hæres. l. 5. c. [31. 2. p. 331.] Et quadraginta diebus in terra conversatus, et visus est sæpe et locutus cum apostolis, et manducavit et bibit, et vulnera quæ ad dubietatem eorum tollendam in corpore reservarat, et videnda et palpanda exposuit. Cyprian. de ascens. D. Christi, init. [p. 55.] *Σὺ δὲ ὅταν ἴδῃς ἀπιστοῦντα τὸν μαθητὴν ἐννόησον τοῦ δεσπότου τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν, πῶς καὶ ὑπὲρ μιᾶς ψυχῆς δείκνυσιν ἑαυτὸν τραύματα ἔχοντα,* Chrysost. in Joh. hom. 87. [vol. II. p. 923.] *Διὰ τοῦτο ἀνέστη ἔχων τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ σταυροῦ.* Ibid. [p. 924.] *Ὥσπερ οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν κυμάτων περιπατοῦντα θεωροῦντες πρὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, οὐ λέγομεν ἄλλης φύσεως τὸ σῶμα ἐκεῖνο ἀλλὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας· οὕτω μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτὸν ὁρῶντες τοὺς τύπους ἔχοντα, οὐκ ἐροῦμεν αὐτὸν φθαρτὸν εἶναι λοιπόν· διὰ γὰρ τὸν μαθητὴν ταῦτα ἐνεδείκνυτο.* Ibid. *Σὺ δὲ, Ἄρειε, πόθεν τὸ βλάσφημον ἐδιδάχθης; πόθεν ἔμαθες ἃ κηρύττεις; Χριστὸν ἐψηλάφησας ὡς ἐγὼ (Θωμᾶς); τὴν χεῖρα προσήνεγκας; τοὺς τύπους ἠρεύνησας;* Id. *εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Θωμᾶν,* vol. V. p. 488. *Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τύπους ἐδείκνυ πληγῶν·* Cyril. Alex. de Trinit. c. 17. [vol. VI. ad fin. p. 23.] But St. Ambrose goeth higher, and saith, "He did not only arise with them, but ascend with them too." Nam quomodo non corpus in quo manebant insignia vulnerum, vestigia cicatricum, quæ Dominus palpanda obtulit, in quo non solum fidem firmat, sed etiam devotionem acuit. Quod vulnera suscepta pro

God, ver. 28. After he had touched him, he perceived him to be the same man, and, by consequence, [c] God too. He believed him to be the same man, because he could touch him; and God, because that body which he touched was raised from the dead. And so Thomas's former unbelief maketh much for the confirmation of our faith[d]. But, 7. after this the disciples saw him again *at the sea of Tiberias*, John xxi. 1, 2, &c. 8. They saw him again immediately before his ascension, Luke xxiv. 36; Acts i. 9. And at this time it is observable, the disciples had clear evidences of the reality, not only of his body, but his soul too; for he [e] ate and drank with them, and so manifested his vegetative soul, Luke xxiv. 43; he discoursed with them, which he could not do unless he heard them speaking unto him, and so by that he manifested his sensitive soul; and he reasoned also with them, saying unto them, *These are the words which I said unto you whilst I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me.* And again, *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the*

---

nobis cœlo inferre maluit, abolere noluit, ut Deo Patri nostræ pretia libertatis ostenderet. Ambros. in Luc. xxiv. [lib. X. 170. vol. I. p. 1540.] V. et Gregor. Magn. in evangel. hom. 29. [vol. I. p. 1568.]

[c] Videbat tangebatque hominem, et confitebatur Deum, quem non videbat neque tangebat. Sed per hoc quod videbat atque tangebat, illud jam remota dubitatione credebat. Aug. in Joh. tract. 121. [5. vol. III. par. ii. p. 809.]: and therefore doth St. Chrysostome also bring in St. Thomas, saying, Ἐξήπλωσα μετὰ τῶν δακτύλων, καὶ τὸ τῆς ψύχης ὄμμα, καὶ δύο λοιπὸν ἐνεργειῶν ᾐσθόμην· ἐκράτουν ἑώρων, καὶ τῇ μὲν χειρὶ σῶμα κατεῖχον, τῇ δὲ ψυχῇ Θεὸν κατενοοῦν. Chrysost. in St. Thom. vol. V. [p. 488.]

[d] Non enim propter se tantum hoc operatus est beatus apostolus, sed quod sibi gessit cunctis proficit. Cum suam enim exercuit solicitudinem fidem omnium confirmavit. Serm. de tempore, [162. vol. V. App. p. 287.] Ille enim dubitando vulnerum cicatrices tetigit et de nostro pectore dubitationis vulnus amputavit. Greg. Mag. in evang. hom. 29. Ἦν δὲ ἄρα καὶ τοῦτο τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας μυστήριον τὸ μὴ παρεῖναι τὸν Θωμᾶν τότε, εἰ γὰρ παρῆν, οὐκ ἂν ἠμφισβήτησεν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀμφέβαλεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐψηλάφησεν· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐψηλάφησεν, οὐκ ἂν οὕτως ἐπίστευσεν· εἰ δὲ μὴ οὕτως ἐπίστευσεν, οὐκ ἂν ἡμᾶς οὕτω πιστεύειν ἐδίδαξεν. ὥστε καὶ ἡ ἀπιστία τοῦ μαθητοῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας πιστέως μήτηρ γεγένηται. Chrys. εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον Θωμᾶν. Vol. V. p. 837.

[e] Παθὼν ὁ κύριος καὶ θανὼν καὶ ταφεὶς ἀπετινάξατο τὴν φθορὰν καὶ τὰ τῆς φθορᾶς.—εἰ δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ὁ κύριος ἔφαγεν, ἀλλὰ κατ᾽ οἰκονομίαν τοῦτο πεποίηκε· τοῖς ἰδίοις παριστῶν μαθηταῖς ὡς αὐτὸς ἦν ἀναστὰς ὁ πρότερον ὢν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν. Cyril. Alex. de Trinit. c. 17, [ad fin. vol. VI. p. 23.]

third day, ver. 44, 46; and this was a clear discovery of his rational soul too. *And last of all he was seen of* Paul *also, as one born out of due time*, 1 Cor. xv. 8. And these are the *witnesses chosen before of God*, which he shewed himself openly unto, Acts x. 40, 41; and of these men it was that Peter saith, *One must be ordained to be a witness with the apostles of his resurrection*, chap. i. 22. But these were all the friends of Christ, and so their testimony may not be thought perhaps so valid in this case. And therefore, to take away all objections, St. Matthew relates how the very [f]adversaries of Christ attested this truth; for *some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all that were done*, Matt. xxviii. 11. And that the things they told them was, that he whom they had crucified the day before the passover was now risen again from the dead, is clear, from the issue of their consultation about the matter, for *they gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept*, ver. 12, 13. If the soldiers had not told them he was risen of himself, what need had they to have bribed them to say he was stolen away by his disciples? And thus have we this great truth, that Christ rose from the dead, attested both by his friends and enemies; both by those that believed in him, and also by those that scoffed at him.

---

[f] Διὰ τούτους τοὺς στρατιώτας ὁ σεισμὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐγένετο, ὥστε αὐτοὺς ἐκπλῆξαι, καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτῶν γένεσθαι τὴν μαρτυρίαν. Ὅπερ οὖν καὶ συνέβη· καὶ γὰρ ἀνύποπτος ἡ ἀπαγγελία οὕτως ἐγένετο παρὰ τῶν φυλάκων προφερομένη· τῶν γὰρ σημείων τὰ μὲν κοινῇ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ τὰ δὲ ἰδίᾳ τοῖς ἐκεῖ παροῦσιν ἐδείκνυτο· κοινῇ μὲν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ τὸ σκότος· ἰδίᾳ δὲ τὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου καὶ τοῦ σεισμοῦ· ἐπεὶ οὖν ἦλθον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν (ἡ γὰρ ἀλήθεια παρὰ τῶν ἐναντίων ἀνακηρυττομένη διαλάμπει) ἐδῶκαν πάλιν ἀργύρια· Chrysost. in Mat. Hom. 90. init. [vol. II. p. 549.] And that the watch did see Christ rising from the grave, Pilate certified Tiberius in his epistle which (it is thought) he wrote unto him; telling him, amongst other things concerning Christ, Crucifixerunt igitur illum, et sepulchro quo conditus erat custodes adhibuerunt, inter quos etiam ex meis militibus nonnulli erant qui tertio die ipsum a mortuis resurgentem viderunt. Pont. Pilat. Epist. ad Tiber. Neron. Imp. extat in monum. patrum, p. 2. [vol. I. ed. Grynæo.] And Nicodemus, in the Gospel attributed to him, saith, that some of the watch said in the synagogue, Quia nobis custodientibus monumentum Jesu facta est terræmotio, et vidimus angelum Dei quomodo revolvit monumenti lapidem et sedebat super eum, et aspectus ejus erat sicut fulgur et vestimentum ejus sicut nix. Et præ timore effecti sumus velut mortui. Et audivimus angelum dicentem

And the scripture having left on record the testimony of so many witnesses for the confirmation of this truth, there is nothing left for reason to do in the case, (it being a matter of fact,) but, first, to shew that the body that those witnesses saw Christ have, after his resurrection, was the selfsame body that he had before his passion; and, secondly, to examine the plea that the high-priest and elders invented to cloak and palliate the business withal. As for the first, that the body which Christ appeared in after, was the same that he had before he was crucified, is clear. First, from Mary's knowing him by his voice: *Jesus saith unto her, Mary: she turneth herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni,* John xx. 16. He had no sooner called her by her name, but she knew him by his voice; which is a plain argument that the organs of his body, whereby he spake, were the same now that they were before, and so his body the same; the distinction of our voices proceeding from the difference there is in the organs or instruments of our bodies that we speak by; so that where the organs of our bodies are different, the voice cannot be the same; and where the voice is the same, the organs cannot be different. Secondly, as it appears from Mary's knowing him by his voice, so also from the apostles' knowing of him by his visage, John xx. 20. xxi. 12; for this shews that not only the organs or instruments of speech, but the whole shape of his body, and all the lineaments of his face, were the same now that they were before; these being the several marks whereby one man is always known from another. Lastly, to name no [g]more, this clearly appears from

---

mulieribus ad sepulchrum Jesu, Nolite timere, scio quod Jesum quæritis crucifixum, hic surrexit sicut prædixit. Venite et videte locum ubi positus erat; et cito euntes dicite discipulis ejus quia surrexit a mortuis et præcedet vos in Galilæam, ibi eum videbitis sicut dixit vobis. Nicod. Evang. de Pass. et Resur. [Ibid. vol. I. p. 649.]

[g] Another proof of the identity of our Saviour's body after, with that it was before his resurrection, might be brought from the words of our Saviour to Thomas, *Behold my hands, and my feet, and my side;* from whence the Fathers, as I before have shewed, conclude that the print and footsteps of the wounds our Saviour had in his hands and feet and side remained also after his resurrection; by which St. Thomas could no longer doubt whether it was the same body or no. Many testimonies of the Fathers I have before cited, to which we may add that also of St. Chrysostome, where he brings in Christ saying to Thomas, Ὡς ἔτι νηπιάζων, ἐν ταῖς ἐμαῖς χερσὶν ἀνάγνωθι γεγραμμένα τὰ τοῦ

the words of the angels to the women, *Why seek ye the living among the dead? he is not here, but is risen*, Luke xxiv. 5, 6; as also from what the soldiers told the elders, that the body that they watched, being the same body that was nailed to the cross the day before the passover, was now risen out of the place where it was laid. So that the selfsame body that was laid there the day before the passover, the selfsame body was raised thence the day after.

But let us now, in the second place, set upon the examination of what the soldiers, being bribed by the elders, reported among the Jews, to hide this so great a mystery from them, that so it might not have any effectual work upon them. Christ, whilst living amongst them, had frequently forewarned them of his resurrection, that he must rise again the third day, Mark viii. 32; and, *Destroy this temple, and in three days*[h] *I will raise it up*, John ii. 19; which and the like expressions stuck foully in the Jews' stomachs after he was dead. And therefore *the chief priests and scribes came together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet living, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first.* Matt. xxvii. 62, 63. *Pilate said unto them, You*

ἐκουσίου μου πάθους τραύματα· παρατίθημί σοι πάντα μου τὰ μέλη πρὸς ἔρευναν· οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι τοῦ σώματός μου τοὺς μώλωπας· οὐκ αἰδοῦμαι τῆς σαρκός μου τὰ τραύματα ἅπερ κατεδεξάμην διὰ τὰ ὑμέτερα τραύματα· Chrysost. εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀποστ. Θωμᾶν, vol. V. p. 839.

[h] In three days, or after three days, i. e. the third from the day wherein it is destroyed, according to the expression immediately foregoing, *he must rise again the third day*, counting the day wherein he suffered to be the first. And in this sense also he calls the space he was to continue in the state of death *three days and three nights*, Matt. xii. 40, though it was but one whole day and two pieces; and herein he spake according to the dialect of the Jews themselves, to whom he spake. For both the Talmuds, disputing about the three days that the Israelites were not to come at their wives before the giving of the law, Exod. xix. 15, say; but R. Eliezer Ben Azariah saith, יום ולילה עונה ומקצת עונה ככולה עונה, "A day and a night make a עונה; and a part of a עונה is accounted as a whole עונה." Schab. per. 9. So here a day and a night make one natural day, and two parts of days are accounted as two whole days. And thus it was that the Fathers loosed this knot. Nam et ipsum triduum quo Dominus mortuus est et resurrexit, nisi isto loquendi modo quo a parte totum dici solet,

have a watch; go your way, make it as sure as you can, ver. 65. And so, they having gotten leave of Pilate, they presently went and made the sepulchre sure, *sealing the stone, and setting a watch*, ver. 66. The watch being set, did faithfully discharge the trust committed to them, watching all night at the sepulchre, that none might steal away the body that lay there. But notwithstanding all their care and watchfulness, in the morning they found the body gone; and that for all that they could do, it did fall out as he had foretold; for he was indeed risen from the dead. Upon this they haste to the chief priests and Pharisees, from whom they had received their command, and acquaint them with the business, which caused them immediately to call a council to consult what to do in this case, who, after some debate about the matter, resolved to corrupt the soldiers with large sums of money, that they might not tell the truth of the business, but to report it about that *the disciples stole him away while they slept*, Matt. xxviii. 12, 13. The soldiers, preferring the money, it seems, before their credit, noise it abroad accordingly, that the disciples of Christ stole him away while they slept: which how unlikely and incredible a thing it is that they should do, let any one judge that doth but consider these following particulars.

First, Is it probable that the disciples, a company of fearful [i] cowards, that had all run away from their master when

---

recte intelligi non potest. Aug. [vol. III. par. ii. p. 135.] De consensu Evang. l. 3. [66.] Ipsum autem triduum non totum et plenum fuisse ipsa scriptura testis est; sed primus dies a parte extrema totus annumeratus est; dies vero tertius a parte prima et ipse totus; medius autem inter eos, id est, secundus dies absolute totus viginti quatuor horis suis, duodecim nocturnis et duodecim diurnis. Id. de Trinit. l. 4. [10. vol. VIII. p. 815.] Hoc solum quærimus, Quomodo tres dies et tres noctes fuerit in corde terræ. Quidam *παρασκευὴν* quando sole fugiente ab hora sexta usque ad horam nonam nox successit diei, in duas dies et noctes dividunt, et apponentes sabbatum tres dies et tres noctes æstimant supputandas: nos vero *συνεκδοχικῶς* totum intelligamus a parte, ut ex eo quod *ἐν παρασκευῇ* mortuus est, unam diem supputemus et noctem et sabbati alteram; tertiam vero noctem, quæ diei et dominicæ nuncupatur, referamus ad exordium diei alterius. Nam et in Genesi nox præcedentis diei non est, sed sequentis, id est, principium futuri non finis præteriti. Hieron. in Jon. ii. 2. [vol. VI. p. 405.]

[i] *Πῶς γὰρ ἔκλεπτον, εἰπέ μοι, οἱ μαθηταὶ ἄνθρωποι πτωχοὶ καὶ ἰδιῶται, καὶ οὐδὲ φανῆναι τολμῶντες; μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἦν σφραγὶς ἐπικειμένη;* Chrysost. in Mat. Hom. 90. [vol. II. p. 550.] *Ὅτι δὲ καὶ δειλοὶ ἦσαν, ἐδή-*

apprehended, should dare to come to steal him away when crucified; especially when the guard, picked and culled out, it is likely, for the present service, was set to watch, and to watch upon that very account, that his disciples might not steal his body away? Or if they had intended to come at all, why not the night [k]before, when the watch was not yet set? It is said, *the next day that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together to Pilate,* &c. Matt. xxvii. 62. And so there was one night wherein there was no guard set to watch it. Is it credible that they should let slip such an opportunity, wherein they might have conveyed away the body without any opposition at all, and venture to attempt it when so strong a watch was set to oppose and apprehend them? But, secondly, suppose the disciples should have put on courage to enterprise such a business, is it likely that they could steal away his body while the watch slept, and awake none of them at all? There was a [l]great stone to be rolled away, so big, it seems, that the two women that went to anoint the body were consulting by the way how to get it removed from the mouth of the sepulchre, Mark xvi. 3. And could such a stone be rolled away, unless it was by the hand of an angel, and not awake the sleeping watch that sat hard by? Thirdly, suppose the disciples should have rolled away the stone, the watch still snorting on, is it credible that they could have leisure to have laid his wind-

---

λωσε τὰ ἔμπροσθεν γεγενημένα· ὅτι γοῦν εἶδον αὐτὸν συνειλημμένον ἅπαντες ἀπεπήδησαν· εἰ τοί νυν τότε οὐδὲ στῆναι ἐτόλμησαν ζῶντα ὁρῶντες, πῶς ἀποθανόντος οὐκ ἂν ἐφοβήθησαν τοσούτων στρατιωτῶν πλῆθος; Ibid. Ἔτι ζῶντα ἰδόντες ἔφυγον, καὶ μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ παρρησιάζεσθαι ἔμελλον εἰ μὴ ἀνέστη; Id. Λογ. εἰς τὴν ταφὴν, &c. vol. V. p. 913.

[k] Εἰ γὰρ ἐβούλοντο τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, μηδέπω φυλαττομένης τῆς θήκης ἐποίησαν ἂν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ νυκτὶ, ὅτε ἀκίνδυνον καὶ ἀσφαλὲς ἦν· τῷ γὰρ σαββάτῳ προσελθόντες ᾐτήσαντο παρὰ τοῦ Πιλάτου τὴν κουστώδιαν, καὶ ἐφύλαττον· τὴν δὲ πρώτην νύκτα οὐδεὶς τούτων τῷ τάφῳ παρῆν. Id. in Mat. Hom. 90. vol. II. p. 550. [24.]

[l] *Λίθος ἐπέκειτο μέγας πολλῶν δεόμενος χειρῶν*, Chrysost. in Mat. Hom. 90. [Ibid. p. 550. 15.] This stone the Jews call גולל; and therefore R. Ben Maimon saith, גולל הוא הכסוי אשר יכסו בו המתים, "Golal is the covering wherewith they cover the dead," in Ohol. c. 2. [fol. קצו.] And that it was a great stone, Obadias de Bartenora expressly, הגולל אבן גדולה ורחבה שסותמים בה פי הקבר מלמעלה מלשון וגללו את האבן, "Golal is a great and wide stone wherewith they cover the mouth of the sepulchre, upon the top of it, from that place of scripture, *They rolled away the stone,*" Gen. xxix. 3.

ing sheet decently wrapped up in one place, and the napkin, or kerchief, that was upon his head, in another place by itself, as we read they were, John xx. 6, 7? Certainly, at such a time, they must needs have been in more haste than to spend their time in such needless curiosities as they were; especially, considering that he was wound up in a linen cloth, with beaten myrrh, and cassia, and other spices, which were of a clammy and [m] sticking nature, and so would require much time and pains too to strip him of, John xix. 40. Fourthly, suppose the body was indeed gone, yea, stolen away by some that had courage and leisure to do the feat, yet how did they know it was the disciples that did it? They profess themselves that they were asleep, and how could they then [n] know who it was that so surprised them while they slept? Fifthly, suppose further, that it was the disciples that indeed stole him away, is it credible that they durst go and say they did it whilst they slept? When Peter was miraculously delivered out of prison by an angel, the keepers that were set to watch him being examined and found guilty, (though alas! they were as far from being guilty of letting Peter go out of prison as these were of letting Christ's body be stolen by his disciples,) I say, being though upon unjust and false grounds found guilty, they were presently commanded to be put to death, Acts xii. 19. And what could these expect, who were guilty of the like crime, but to be served the same sauce? And it is probable they feared no less, if they should but report such a thing abroad, that the body was stolen while they slept, from the Pharisees' words to them, *And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him and secure you*, Matt. xxviii. 14: which plainly implies, that if the governor should come to hear of it that the watch slept, and suffered the body to be stolen, he would presently call them to an account for it. And is it credible, that they should thus prove their own accusers and hazard their lives, yea condemn themselves out of their own mouths? But we find the contrary here, for they tell every one they meet, that whilst sleep kept all their senses locked up, there come the disciples and steal the body away they were set to watch; and yet none calls them into question about it, nor inflicts any punishment upon them for it. Which clearly shews, that there was daubing in the business; and that, let the soldiers say what they will, he was not *stolen away privately while they slept*, but was raised up insensibly whilst they watched. Sixthly, if the disciples had stole him away by night, is it likely that they would go up and down the world, and preach obedience to him that had promised indeed to rise again the third day, but before that day came they were forced to take him up, otherwise he had not been raised at all? Certainly it was the mystery of his [o] resurrection that emboldened them to proclaim his name over all the world; which had it not been a real thing, they who were so wise, as appears from their actions, as to put all the learned Jews to it, to call council upon council to suppress them, would never have been so sottish as to have spent their time in persuading men to believe in a crucified Christ, who still lay in the jaws of death, contrary to the promise that he made them, that he would rise again to life. But seventhly, though they might be so much overseen as to extol and preach obedience to his name a while, is it probable that they would all venture their very lives for him who still lay dead amongst them? Ecclesiastical history[p] assures us, that there was not one of the apostles, except John, but suffered martyrdom for the sake of Christ. James had the sword of king Herod sheathed in his bowels, and so his blood let out for Christ who shed his blood for him, Acts xii. 1, 2. Peter was crucified with his heels upwards, looking upon himself as unworthy to be crucified like his Lord Christ. Matthew was run through with a sword, or, as others think, he was fastened to the ground with nails or spears. Andrew was crucified by Egeas, king of Edessa. Philip was stoned to death at Hierapolis in Phrygia. Bartholomew was beaten down with clubs as he was preaching in Armenia, his skin being afterwards flead off. Thomas was slain with a dart at Calamina, in India. The other James was cast headlong from the temple, as some think. Lebbeus was slain by Agbarus, king of Edessa. Simon the Canaanite was crucified in Egypt, or, as others think, he and Jude were slain in a popular tumult. Matthias was first stoned, and then beheaded: and John himself, though he did not suffer death for Christ, yet he was cast into burning oil, as it is thought, by Nero at Rome, as some, at Ephesus as others suppose, and suffered no harm thereby; and afterwards he was banished by Domitian into the isle of Patmos. Now is it likely that all these should suffer such deaths and tortures for one, who their own consciences could not but tell them still remained under the power of death, and none of them bewray the matter before they die, but all of them lay down their lives for him? Could grim death himself, in his most ghastly posture, wrest nothing from them? What! live and die too in the same faith, that he that was crucified by men was raised up by God? Who could think that they, of any men in the world, should have had any hand in such a thing? Certainly they might have fathered their lie and forgery upon any one rather than these, who so unanimously sealed it with their own blood, that it was God himself that raised him from the grave. Lastly, suppose after all this, that yet it was the disciples that stole his body away while the watch slept. Yet how came he to live again? Though they might take his body from the grave, could they put life into his body too? We have read that there were many hundreds that saw him after he was crucified, as really alive as he was before. And this may put the matter quite out of doubt, that it was a mere fable, a downright lie, that was famed abroad, that his disciples stole him away while the watch slept; and that it is a real truth, that he alone who could call back his soul again into his body, was the person who raised up his body from the grave; and so that Christ did truly arise from the dead.

---

[m] Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο προλαβὼν ὁ Ἰωάννης φησὶν ὅτι σμύρνῃ συνετάφη πολλῇ, ἣ μολύβδου οὐχ ἧττον συγκολλᾷ τῷ σώματι τὰ ὀθόνια· ἵν᾽ ὅταν ἀκούσῃς ὅτι τὰ σουδάρια ἔκειτο ἰδίᾳ, μὴ ἀνάσχῃ τῶν λεγόντων ὅτι ἐκλάπη· οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἀνόητος ἦν ὁ κλέπτων, ὡς περὶ πρᾶγμα περιττὸν τοσαύτην ἀναλίσκειν σπουδήν. Chrysost. in Joh. λογ. πε. vol. II. p. 916. Μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι σμύρνα ἦν, φάρμακον οὕτω κολλῶδες τῷ σώματι καὶ τοῖς ἱματίοις προσπεπηγὸς, ὅθεν οὐκ εὔκολον ἦν ἀποσπᾶσαι τὰ ἱμάτια τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου οἱ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες ἐδέοντο. Chrys. in Mat. Hom. 90. [Ibid. p. 550. 30.]

[n] Ecce falsi testes et contra resurgentem. Quanta autem cæcitas in falsis testibus, quanta cæcitas fratres? Solent hoc enim pati falsi testes, ut excæcentur et contra se dicant nescientes, unde appareat quod falsi sunt testes. Quid enim illi contra se dixerunt? *Cum dormiremus venerunt discipuli ejus, et abstulerunt eum.* Quid est hoc? Quis est qui dixit testimonium? Qui dormiebat. Talibus ego narrantibus non crederem; nec si somnia sua mihi indicarent. Stulta insania si vigilabas quare permisisti? Si dormiebas unde scisti? August. in Psa. 36. [ser. ii. 17. vol. IV. p. 274.] Acceperunt pecuniam ut mentirentur; dixerunt cum dormiremus venerunt discipuli ejus et abstulerunt eum. Tales autem cæci erant Judæi ut crederent dicto omnino incredibili. Crediderunt testibus dormientibus, aut falsum erat quod dormierant, et mendacibus credere non debuerunt; aut verum erat quod dormierunt et quod factum est nescierunt. Id. in Psal. 55. [9. Ib. p. 523.]

---

[o] Παραγγελίας οὖν λαβόντες, καὶ πληροφορηθέντες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πιστωθέντες τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μετὰ πληροφορίας πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἐξῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ μέλλειν ἔρχεσθαι. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Cor. p. 54. Ὅθεν δῆλον ὅτι εἰ μὴ εἶδον ἀναστάντα καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ μεγίστην ἔλαβον ἀπόδειξιν, οὐκ ἂν τοσοῦτον ἀνέρριψαν κύβον. Chrys. in 1 Cor. Hom. 4. [vol. III. p. 264. 34.]

---

[p] Hist. Eccles. Magd. [vol. I.] Cent. I. l. 2. c. 10. de vitis doctorum; et Hieron. in Catalogo scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum. [Hieron. vol. II. p. 809.]

And this, the foundation of our Christian religion, the Fathers do frequently insist upon, and give their assent to. To begin with Clemens, bishop of Rome, who was contemporary with St. Paul himself. [q] "Let us consider with ourselves, beloved," (saith he,) "how the Lord continually sheweth that the resurrection is to come, the firstfruits whereof he hath made the Lord Jesus Christ, having raised him from the dead." The next to him is Ignatius, who doth frequently press the belief of this Article; but there is one place in his Epistle to the church of Smyrna more remarkable than any of the rest; where he saith, [r] "But I (do not only know by his nativity and crucifixion, that he was really incarnate, but) after his resurrection saw him in the flesh, and believe that he is so still. And when he came to those that were with Peter, and said to them, Take *and handle me, and see* that *I am not* an incorporeal *spirit, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me have.*" Where, I confess, what I translate, "I saw him in the flesh," [s] others expound, "I know he was in the flesh;" and I must also acknowledge that St. Chrysostome saith, that he neither saw Christ nor enjoyed any converse with him [t]. But St. Hierome (and so his interpreter Sophronius) expressly renders the words of Ignatius, [u] "But I also, after his resurrection, saw him in the flesh." And Nicephorus saith, [x] "Ignatius, when a child, was one of those little children that our Saviour took up in his arms, when he said, *Unless ye become like one of these little children, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.*"

---

[q] Κατανοήσωμεν, ἀγαπητοὶ, πῶς ὁ δεσπότης ἐπιδείκνυται διηνεκῶς ἡμῖν τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀνάστασιν ἔσεσθαι, ἧς τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ἐποιήσατο τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσας. Clem. Epist. ad Corinth. pp. 33, 34.

[r] Ἐγὼ δὲ (οὐκ ἐν τῷ γεννᾶσθαι καὶ σταυροῦσθαι γινώσκω αὐτὸν ἐν σώματι γεγονέναι μόνον, ἀλλὰ) καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα, καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα· καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πετρὸν ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς· Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον, πνεῦμα γὰρ σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει, καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrnenses, [p. 112.]

From Ignatius we shall go to Justin Martyr, who tells us, that "the [y] Lord remained upon the cross almost until the evening, and about evening they buried him; but afterwards he rose again the third day." And elsewhere, [z] "But upon Sunday we commonly all meet together, because that was the first day, wherein God turning over the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour upon that day arose from the dead. For the day before Saturday they crucified him, and the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, appearing to his apostles and disciples, he taught them those things which we, for your understanding, deliver unto you."

And that Christ rose from the dead, Tertullian also expresseth, though obscurely and paradoxically, yet very acutely and elegantly: "[a] The Son of God was born: I am not ashamed of it, because it is a thing to be ashamed of. The Son of God died: this is altogether credible, because it is absurd. And after he was buried he arose again: it is certain, because it is impossible." And Athanasius doth not only assert the truth of his resurrection, but gives the reason also why he rose no sooner, and why he lay no longer than three days, saying, "But [b] he suffered not the temple of his body to remain long (in the grave); but having shewn only that it was dead, by its conflict with death, upon the third day he presently arose, bringing with him his trophies and victories over death, even incorruptibility and impassibility in his body. He could indeed presently after death have raised up his body, and have shewn it alive again; but our Saviour, well foreseeing the issue, would not do it. For then some might have said he was not truly dead, or not fully struck with death, if he had immediately after death manifested his resurrection: and perhaps also, if there had been no interval betwixt his death and resurrection, the glory of his incorruptibility would not have been so manifest. Wherefore, that his body might clearly appear to be dead, the Word tarried one middle day (in the grave); and upon the third day shewed it incorruptible unto all. That therefore he might manifest death in his body, he arose the third day. Neither would he suffer his body to be longer detained there and corrupted, lest at the last, when he did rise, he should not be believed to have the same, but another body. (For then it might come to pass, that by reason of the length of the time, they would not believe when he did appear, and that the things that were done should be forgotten.) And for that he would not remain longer than three days; neither would he keep those that had heard him foretelling his resurrection any longer in suspense."

---

[s] So Ruffinus, Ego autem post resurrectionem quoque in carne eum scio fuisse et credo. And Grotius, Si quis locum Ignatii cum cura inspiciat, videbit rectam esse lectionem *οἶδα*; neque de visus sensu ibi agi, sed de fide, quam non suo sed aliorum testimonio confirmat.

[t] *Ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἐτελεύτησε, μὴ μόνον Πέτρον καὶ Παῦλον ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἰγνάτιον τὸν οὐδὲ ἑωρακότα αὐτὸν, οὐδὲ ἀπολελαυκότα αὐτοῦ τῆς συνουσίας.* Chrysost. *εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἱερομάρτυρα Ἰγνάτιον.* Vol. V. p. 503.

[u] Ego vero et post resurrectionem eum in carne vidi. Hieron. in Catal. Script. Eccles. *Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σώματι αὐτὸν εἶδον.* Sophron. Interp. Hieron. [vol. II. p. 842.]

[x] *Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον, τὸν ὄντως θεόληπτον τὸν θεοφόρον ἐτίθει Ἰγνάτιον· ὃν ἔτι νήπιον ὄντα, ὡς ἁπλοῦν καὶ ἀκέραιον ἐνδεικνύμενος, εἰ μὴ ἐπίσης ἐκείνῳ γένοιντο, διεδείκνυ, ἥκιστα ἔλεγε τῆς κηρυττομένης βασιλείας ἐπιτυχεῖν.* Niceph. Hist. Eccles. l. 2. c. 35. [vol. I. p. 192.]

[y] *Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Κύριος σχεδὸν μέχρις ἑσπέρας ἔμεινεν ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου, καὶ πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἔθαψαν αὐτόν· εἶτα ἀνέστη τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.* Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. [97. p. 193.]

[z] *Τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα· ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας κοσμὸν ἐποίησε, καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρα ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη· τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν, καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν κρονικὴν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡλίου ἡμέρα, φανεὶς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν.* Id. pro Christ. Apol. [I. 67. p. 84.]

---

[a] Natus est Dei Filius, non pudet quia pudendum est. Et mortuus est Dei Filius, prorsus credibile est quia ineptum est. Et sepultus resurrexit, certum est quia impossibile est. Tertul. de carne Christi, [cap. V.]

[b] Τὸν δὲ ἑαυτοῦ ναὸν σῶμα οὐκ ἐπὶ πολὺ μένειν ἀνασχόμενος, ἀλλὰ μόνον δεῖξας νεκρὸν τῇ τοῦ θανάτου πρὸς αὐτὸ συμπλοκῇ, τριταῖον ἀνέστησεν εὐθὺς, τρόπαια καὶ νίκας κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου φέρων τὴν ἐν τῷ σώματι γενομένην ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ ἀπάθειαν· ἠδύνατο μὲν γὰρ καὶ παρ' αὐτὰ τοῦ θανάτου τὸ σῶμα διεγεῖραι, καὶ πάλιν δεῖξαι ζῶν· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο καλῶς προϊδὼν σωτὴρ οὐ πεποίηκεν· εἶπε γὰρ ἂν τὶς μηδόλως αὐτὸ τεθνηκέναι, ἢ μηδὲ τέλεον αὐτοῦ τὸν θάνατον ἐψαυκέναι, εἰ παρ' αὐτὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἦν ἐπιδείξας· τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐν ἴσῳ τοῦ διαστήματος ὄντος τοῦτε θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, ἄδηλον ἐγίνετο τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας κλέος· ὅθεν ἵνα δειχθῇ νεκρὸν τὸ σῶμα καὶ μίαν ὑπέμεινε μέσην ὁ λόγος, καὶ τριταῖον τοῦτο πᾶσιν ἔδειξεν ἄφθαρτον· ἕνεκα μὲν οὖν τοῦ δειχθῆναι τὸν θάνατον ἐν τῷ σώματι τριταῖον ἀνέστησε τοῦτο· ἵνα δὲ μὴ ἐπὶ πολὺ διαμεῖναν καὶ φθαρὲν τέλεον ὕστερον ἀναστήσας ἀπιστηθῇ, ὡς οὐκ αὐτὸ ἀλλ' ἕτερον σῶμα φέρων (ἔμελλε γὰρ ἄν τις καὶ διὰ αὐτὸν χρόνον ἀπιστεῖν τῷ φαινομένῳ καὶ ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι τῶν γενομένων) διὰ τοῦτο οὐ πλείω τῶν τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἠνέσχετο, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ τοὺς ἀκούσαντας αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως παρείλκυσεν. Athanas. de incarn. Verbi, [26. vol. I. p. 69.]

Next to Athanasius comes St. Cyril of Hierusalem; for this was an article of his faith too, that Christ arose from the dead: "I believe[c]" (saith he) "that Christ was raised from the dead. For, for this I have many witnesses, both out of the Divine scriptures, and from the testimony and operation unto this day of him that rose again." And St. Chrysostome, "But [d] that they may learn, that whilst he was living, what he suffered he suffered willingly; behold the seal, and stone, and custody, and watch, all could not detain him that was dead, but that one thing fell out alone, that even from thence his resurrection was published abroad." Yea, so that St. Augustine tells us, "that the resurrection[e] of Christ, and his ascent into heaven with that body wherewith he arose, is now preached and believed over the whole world; and if it be incredible, how comes it to be believed in all the earth?"

But these, you will say, are all Christians; and therefore it is no wonder if they avouch all this and more of Christ; but where is there a Jew that will say as much? Yes, there is Josephus by name, a Jew by nation and religion too, yet speaketh as much concerning this particular as any Christian hath or can speak: for he, speaking of Christ by the bye, gives us this short but full and true relation of him. "But[f] about this time lived one Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he did many strange and admirable works, and was the teacher of such as willingly received the truth; and he drew unto him many of the Jews, and many of the Greeks too, to be his followers. This was the Christ: and him did the chief men among us accuse. And after Pilate had crucified him, they that loved him before did not yet forsake him: for he appeared unto them the third day alive again, the divine prophets having spoken these, and a thousand such wonderful things before of him. And unto this moment, the race of the Christians, called so from him, hath never ceased." Thus we see both scripture, reason, and Fathers asserting the truth of this Article; yea, and the very enemies of Christ forced into the acknowledgment of it: so that he must be worse than a Jew that will not subscribe unto it, that *Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature.*

---

[c] *Πιστεύω ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται, πολλὰς γὰρ ἔχω τὰς περὶ τούτου μαρτυρίας ἔκ τε τῶν θείων γραφῶν, καὶ ἐκ τῆς μέχρι σήμερον τοῦ ἀναστάντος μαρτυρίας καὶ ἐνεργείας.* Cyril. Hieros. Cateches. 14. [9. p. 197.]

[d] *Ἀλλ' ἵνα μάθωσιν ὅτι καὶ ζῶν ἑκὼν ἔπαθεν ἅπερ ἔπαθεν, ἰδοὺ καὶ σφραγὶς, καὶ λίθος, καὶ κουστωδία, καὶ πᾶσα φυλακὴ, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν τὸν νεκρὸν κατασχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἓν γίνεται μόνον τὸ δημοσιευθῆναι ἐντεῦθεν τὴν ἀνάστασιν.* Chrysost. *εἰς τὴν ταφὴν,* [vol. V. p. 914. 29.]

[e] Resurrectio certe Christi et in cœlum cum carne in qua resurrexit ascensio toto jam mundo prædicatur et creditur. Si credibilis non est, unde toto terrarum orbe jam credita est? Aug. de civitate Dei, l. 22. c. 5. [vol. VII. p. 659.]

Wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all men at the last day.

The selfsame person that was betrayed by Judas, apprehended by the officers, accused by the Jews, condemned by Pilate, and crucified by the soldiers, being restored again to life, after he had remained three days in the state of death: did as really appear to and converse with his apostles and disciples after this his resurrection, as he had done before his passion. He did not immediately ascend to heaven so soon as raised from the grave, but still continued some time upon the face of earth, the more to [g] confirm his disciples in this great mystery of his resurrection, and other articles of the faith he had before instructed them in. In which space of time, (to wit forty days,) as he appeared to none but his disciples[h], so neither did he appear to them [i] continually, but only now and then, that so he might by degrees wean them from his bodily presence, which within few days they were no longer to enjoy: and raise up their minds to the contemplation of the greater mysteries of the gospel he had revealed unto them.

---

[f] Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἴγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή. ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητὴς, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῇ τ᾽ ἀληθῆ δεχομένων. Καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ Ἑλληνικοὺς ἐπηγάγετο. Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν, σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἵ γε πρῶτον ἀγαπήσαντες. Ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν· τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλα μύρια θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Εἴς τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φῦλον· καὶ ὑπὸ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους. Joseph. Antiq. Judaic. l. 18. c. 4. [3. p. 798.]

But as he did not ascend to heaven so soon as raised from the grave, so neither was it long after he was raised from the grave before he ascended up to heaven; for it was but forty days; and so the same time that he had remained in the wilderness, before his temptation by Satan, the same time he now remains upon earth before his ascension to God; which time being expired, he is now carried up to heaven to be glorified by God, as he was then carried into the wilderness to be tempted by the Devil. Not as if Christ, as God, thus[k] ascended from earth to heaven, for as God he never was so in heaven as not to be upon earth, nor so on earth as not to be in heaven at the same time: as God he is included in no place, nor excluded out of any, and so is incapable of descending from an higher place to a lower, or ascending from a lower place to a higher. But though not as God, yet he that was God as well as man, in that nature wherein he was man as well as God, was truly and locally translated from these lower parts of the world where we live, unto those higher regions where the angels and glorified saints reside. So that the body of Christ (was not, according to that wild opinion of some of [l]the heretics of old, left in the sun, but it) was by a true and real local motion conveyed from earth to heaven, so as to be as really and substantially afterwards in heaven, and not on earth, as it was really and substantially before on earth, and not in heaven.

---

[g] Διά τοι τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἔμεινε μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ἔλεγχον διδοὺς ἐν τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ ὄψεως τῆς οἰκείας, ἵνα μὴ φάντασμα εἶναι νομίσωσι τὸ ὁρώμενον. Chrysost. in Acta apost. hom. 1. [vol. IV. p. 611. 19.] Ad hoc necessaria fuit hujus temporis mora, ut recollectis quos in fugam timor impegerat, quos supplicium crucis terruerat, in multis argumentis apparens mentes quæ diffidentia titubaverant solidaret: nec esse phantasticum, sed verum corpus quod surrexerat tam comessationibus quam contrectationibus probaret. Ad hoc dilata est ascensionis gloria, ut sub hoc dierum interstitio præcedens doctrina affectibus firmaretur. Cyprian. Serm. de ascens. Christ. [ad fin. op. Cypr. p. 55.] Ἔδει μὲν οὖν συνάπτεσθαι τῇ ἀναστάσει τοῦ σωτῆρος τὴν ἄνοδον, καὶ τὸν τοῦ ᾅδου νικητὴν, εὐθὺς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὑποδέξασθαι· ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ τὸ τάχος τῶν γινομένων κλέψῃ τὴν αἴσθησιν, παγῆναι τῷ χρόνῳ βούλεται τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ τῆς θεωρίας τὰ θαύματα, καὶ τῇ συνεχεῖ τῶν ὀμμάτων προσβολῇ, τῇ ψυχῇ παραπέμψαι τὴν πίστιν. Athanas. in assump. Domini nostri Jesu Christi [5. vol. II. p. 465.]

[h] Et resurgens apparuit discipulis suis: non apparuit inimicis suis, sed discipulis suis. Crucifixus apparuit omnibus, resurgens fidelibus; ut etiam postea qui vellet crederet, et credenti resurrectio promitteretur. August. in Psal. 65. [6. vol. IV. p. 645.] Τίνος δὲ ἕνεκεν οὐχὶ πᾶσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐφάνη; ὅτι φάντασμα ἂν ἔδοξεν εἶναι τοῖς πολλοῖς οὐκ εἰδόσι τὸ ἀπόρρητον τοῦ μυστηρίου· εἰ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἠπίστουν τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐθορυβοῦντο, καὶ ἁφῆς ἐδεήθησαν τῆς διὰ χειρὸς, καὶ τραπέζης, τὶ τοὺς πολλοὺς εἰκὸς παθεῖν ἦν; Chrysost. in Acta apost. hom. 1. [vol. IV. p. 611. 5.]

[i] Οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ πρὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἀεὶ μετ' αὐτῶν ἦν οὕτω καὶ τότε· οὐ γὰρ εἶπε τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας, ἀλλὰ δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα· ἐφίστατο γὰρ καὶ ἀφίστατο πάλιν· τί δήποτε; ἀνάγων αὐτῶν τὰς διανοίας καὶ οὐκ ἔτι συγχωρῶν ὁμοίως πρὸς αὐτὸν διακεῖσθαι ὥσπερ καὶ ἔμπροσθεν· Ibid. [p. 610. 43.]

Neither did the human nature of Christ thus ascend from earth to heaven presently to descend again from heaven to earth, but thither it ascended, and there it hath remained for above this sixteen hundred years together; and there it now, even at this very moment, sitteth at the right hand of God, and there it will sit until his second coming to judgment. I say, and there he sitteth at the right hand of God; which words though they be not expressed here, they are in the Creed; yea, and in the scriptures it is said, *He was received up into heaven, and sat at the right hand of God*, Mark xvi. 19; which was no more than what David had long ago foretold of him, saying, [m] *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool,* Heb. i. 13. In which and the like places, by the right hand of God we must not understand it as if God had any right or left hand, as the words signify amongst us; for God, as I have shewn, is a Spirit, having no body or parts, nor by consequence any right or left hand; but by Christ's sitting at the right hand of God we are to understand (with the [n] Fathers) that glory, happiness, and honour which was conferred upon Christ when ascended up to heaven. Though it was in the human nature that he ascended, yet that nature was there exalted above all other creatures whatsoever; and therefore may well be said to sit at the right hand of God; that being the place which amongst us, who have right and left hands, is accounted the highest. Thither it was that Christ at the first ascended; there it is that he hath ever since remained; there it is that he now sitteth whilst I am speaking of him, and there it is that he will sit until the time that both quick and dead shall be assembled before him to receive their doom and final sentence from him.

---

[k] Ascendit ergo ad cœlos, non ubi verbum Deus ante non fuerat, quippe qui erat semper in cœlis et manebat in patre, sed ubi verbum caro factum non sedebat. Ruffin. in expos. symb. [p. 25.]

[l] Of this absurd opinion were the Manicheans of old, according to Gregory Nazianzen: *Ποῦ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα νῦν εἰ μὴ μετὰ τοῦ προσλαβόντος; οὐ γὰρ δὴ κατὰ τοὺς Μανιχαίων λήρους τῷ ἡλίῳ ἐναποτέθειται, ἵνα τιμηθῇ διὰ τῆς ἀτιμίας.* Epist. 1. ad Cledonium, [vol. I. p. 739.] And the Seleucians and Hermians also, of whom St. Augustine; Negant salvatorem in carne sedere ad dextram patris, sed ea se exuisse perhibent, eamque in sole posuisse, accipientes occasionem de psalmo, In sole posuit tabernaculum suum. August. Hæres. 59. [vol VIII. p. 20.]

---

[m] This place of scripture some of the Jews themselves expound of the Messiah; ר״ יודן בשר״ חמא אמר לעתיד הקבה״ לבא מושיב מלך המשיח לימינו שנ״ נאם יי לאדני שב לימיני, i. e. R. Joden said in the name of R. Hamah, "That in time to come the Blessed One will set king Messiah at his right hand, because it is said, *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand.*" Midr. Til. Ps. 18. [fol. יי v.] Indeed it seems that the Jews in our Saviour's time did generally acknowledge it to be spoken of the Messiah, otherwise some of them surely would have gainsayed it when our Saviour put this gloss upon it, Luke xx. 42; their silence seems to argue their consent to that interpretation. And the place being so clearly to be understood of Christ, therefore doth the Syriac entitle this Psalm, ܠܕܘܝܕ ܥܠ ܡܘܬܒܗ ܕܐܕܘܢܝ ܘܥܠ ܚܝܠܗ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܘܢܒܝܘܬܐ ܥܠ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܙܟܘܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܒܥܠܕܒܒܐ, i. e. "A psalm of David concerning the sitting of the Lord, and concerning his glorious power, and a prophecy concerning the Messiah, and his victory over the enemy."

[n] *Δεξιὰν δὲ ἀκούων τοῦ Θεοῦ, μὴ τόπους καὶ σχήματα δόξης περιγράφει· δεξιὰ γὰρ καὶ ἀριστερὰ περιγραφομένων ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἄπλαστος καὶ ἀόριστος καὶ ἀσχημάτιστος καὶ ἀπερίγραπτός ἐστι· δεξιὰν δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅταν ἀκούσῃς, τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι νόει.* Athanas in dict. et interpr. parab. S. Script. Quæst. 45. [vol. II. p. 318.] *Τὸ γὰρ δεξιὸν οὐ τὴν κάτω χώραν δηλοῖ (ὡς ὁ τούτων λόγος) ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ ἴσον σχέσιν, οὐ σωματικῶς τοῦ δεξιοῦ λαμβανομένου (οὕτω γὰρ ἄν τι· καὶ σκαιὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἴη) ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν τιμίων τῆς προεδρίας ὀνομάτων, τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς τῆς περὶ τὸν υἱὸν τιμῆς παριστῶντος τοῦ λόγου.* Basil. de Spiritu Sancto [cap. vi. vol. II. p. 302.] Quæ est autem Patris dextera nisi paterna illa ineffabilisque felicitas, quo pervenit Filius hominis et jam carnis immortalitate percepta. Aug. de Trinitate et Unitate Dei, c. 8. [vol. VIII. p. 632.] *Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἰπὼν ἐν δεξιᾷ οὐκ ἐσχημάτισεν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὁμότιμον ἔδειξε τὸ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα·* Chrysost. in Epist. ad Hebræos, hom. 2. [vol. IV. p. 439. 5.] Secundum consuetudinem nostram illi consessus offertur, qui aliquo opere perfecto, honoris gratia promeretur ut sedeat. Ita ergo et homo Jesus Christus passione sua diabolum superans, resurrectione sua inferna reserans, tanquam perfecto opere ad cœlos victor adveniens audit a Deo Patre, *Sede ad dexteram meam.* Maxim. Taurin. de Pentecoste, hom. 1. [Hept. præsul. p. 222.] Dextera autem Patris, ad quam idem Filius sedere creditur, non est corporea (quod nefas est de Deo sentire.) Sed dextera Patris est, beatitudo perpetua quæ sanctis in resurrectione promittitur, id est, sanctæ ecclesiæ quæ est corpus Christi: sicut et sinistra ejus recte intelligitur miseria et pœna perpetua quæ impiis dabitur. Isidor. Hispal. de Eccles. Offic. l. 1. c. [32. p. 591.]

And if we search the scriptures for their testimony unto this great truth, *the ascension of Christ into heaven*, we shall find them both typically representing and prophetically foretelling in the Old, and also positively asserting and historically relating of it in the New Testament. First, in the Old Testament we have it typically represented, and prophetically foretold. First, typically represented[o] both in Enoch's translation and in Elijah's ascension into heaven; but more fully in the high-priest's entering into the holy of holies. For the high-priest under the law, being to make atonement for the sins of the people, was appointed once, and but once, every year to enter into the holy of holies. For *the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the vail, before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not*, Lev. xvi. 2. And *Aaron shall make an atonement upon the horns of the altar once in a year with the blood of the sin-offerings of atonements*, Exod. xxx. 10. This doth the apostle apply to Christ: *But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having*

---

[o] Sicut autem Joseph a fratribus venditus venditionem redemptoris nostri figuravit; sic Enoch translatus, atque ad cœlum aereum Helias sublevatus ascensionem dominicam uterque designavit. Gregor. Mag. in Evang. hom. 28, [6. vol. I. p. 1572.]

obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. ix. 11, 12. The [p] tabernacle, that did signify the world below, the holy of holies, the heavens above. Now as the high priest did once, and but once, every year pass with the blood of the sacrifice through the tabernacle into the holy of holies; so did Christ, having offered up himself a sacrifice for sin, and with his own blood passed through this world below, he entered into the highest heavens. And this is that which we call his *ascension*.

And as this mystery was typically represented, so was it also prophetically foretold in the Old Testament; as in that of David, *Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in*, Psalm xxiv. 7. Which words, though they may have another literal, yet this is the mystical and prophetical sense the [q] Fathers put upon them, even to denote the ascension of Christ, the King of Glory, into the highest heavens. But the clearest prophecy of this so great a mystery is delivered in those words, *Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell amongst them*, Psalm lxviii. 18. Which place, that it is to be understood of Christ, the same Spirit that dictated it to David certifies us by

---

[p] *Γῆς μὲν μίμημα καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ, τὸ τῆς σκηνῆς πρόσωπον θεωρούμενον. Τὰ δὲ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐνδοτέρω διατειχίσας παραπετάσματι, ἀνθρώποις καταλείψας ἀθέατον οὐρανοῦ τινὰ τάξιν, τῷ μὴ φαινομένῳ μέρει χαρίζεται· ἀλλ᾽ οὕτως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς διὰ τῶν σχημάτων νομοθετήσας τὴν μίμησιν, τὰ ἐν ἀδύτῳ ἄβατα πάλιν ἀνθρώποις εἶναι θελήσας, μόνῳ τῷ ἀρχιερατεύοντι, τῶν ἀπορρήτων ἀνοίγει τὴν εἴσοδον, τῆς εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνόδου τὴν τοῦ τότε ἀρχιερέως εἴσοδον τυπικῶς ἐργαζόμενος.* Athanas. in assumptione D. nostri Jesu Christi, vol. II. [4. p. 464.]

[q] *Κύριος οὖν τῶν δυνάμεων ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Σαλομὼν ἀποδέδεικται, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ὅτε ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνέβαινεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, κελεύονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ταχθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄρχοντες, ἀνοῖξαι τὰς πύλας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ οὗτος ὅς ἐστι βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, καὶ ἀνάβας καθίσῃ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πάτρος.* Just. Dial. cum Tryph. Jud. [36. p. 134.] *Τὴν δὲ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἄνοδον ὁδοποιῶν ἀνεκαίνιζε λέγων πάλιν, ἄρατε πύλας οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπάρθητε πύλαι αἰώνιοι.* Athan. de incarn. Verbi, [25. vol. I. p. 69.] Et introibit Rex Gloriæ, ut ad dexteram Patris interpellet pro nobis. Aug. in loc. [vol. IV. p. 105.] Denique quia novus iste ingressus portarum cœli æditituis et principibus videbatur, videntes naturam carnis cœlorum secreta penetrantem, dicunt ad invicem, sicut David plenus Spiritu enunciat, *Tollite portas principes*, &c. Quæ vox utique non propter divinitatis potentiam, sed propter novitatem carnis ascendentis ad dexteram Dei ferebatur. Ruffin. in expos. symb. [p. 25.]

St. Paul, who, speaking of Christ, tells us, *Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men*, Eph. iv. 8. It was Christ who, rising from earth to heaven, sent down his gifts from heaven to earth. It was here that he bought them for us; but it is from thence that he poureth them forth upon us. And this place must needs be understood (as after St. Paul the Fathers[r] generally interpret it) of the ascension of the Messiah, there being no other person that ever did so ascend on high, as to lead captivity captive and to give gifts to men, but he who, ascending up to heaven, triumphed over all our spiritual enemies, captivating sin, Satan, and death, that used to captivate us; and after his ascending up to the right hand of God sent such gifts to the sons of men as we shall presently see he did.

We have seen the typical representations and the prophetical predictions of this in the Old, we now come to consider the positive assertions and historical relations of it in the New Testament. As for the first, Christ before his ascension asserted that he would ascend: *Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God,* John xx. 17. And what our Saviour said he would do, St. Paul asserts he did, saying, that *He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things,* Eph. iv. 10. As it was Christ that descended, so was it Christ that ascended. But it is the historical relation of this grand mystery that giveth both the greatest light and testimony to it. And that we might be throughly confirmed in it, it is no less than three times recorded to us; first by St. Mark, who briefly relates it thus: *So then, after the Lord had spoken to them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God*, Mark xvi. 19. Something more fully by St. Luke in his Gospel, *And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lift up his eyes and blessed them. And it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up to heaven*, Luke xxiv. 50. But fullest of all by the same St. Luke in his history of the Acts of the Apostles, where it is left on record, that this Christ shewed himself alive to his apostles after his passion, and that he was seen of them forty days, at the end whereof he had assembled them together, instructing them in the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; *And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven*, Acts i. 9—11. In which words we have these things observable. First, that Christ did really ascend: he was really taken away from the apostles he was conversing withal, and that upwards, for they saw that he that was talking with them before is taken up from them now. Secondly, that it was into heaven that he ascended; which that we might be assured of, the inhabitants of that glorious place, the citizens of that New Jerusalem, come down to acquaint us. The apostles saw he was taken up, but whither he went they could not see; their eyes could reach no further than the cloud

---

[r] *Ὅτι ἐπεπροφήτευτο τοῦτο μέλλειν γίνεσθαι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνέλευσιν αὐτοῦ, εἶπον μὲν ἤδη καὶ πάλιν λέγω. Εἶπεν οὖν, ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος, ᾐχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν,* &c. Just. Dial. cum Tryph. [87.] Consummatis etenim his quæ in terra gerebantur et animabus de inferni captivitate revocatis, ascendere memoratur ad cœlos, sicut propheta prædixerat, *Ascendens in altum captivam duxit captivitatem.* Ruffin. in expos. symb. [p. 25.] Christo ergo sine dubitatione dictum est, *Ascendisti in altum, captivasti captivitatem,* Aug. in loc. [vol. IV. p. 679.] Quia enim ascensionis ejus mysterium Judæam non intelligere conspexit, de infidelitate ejus per figuram beatus Job sententiam protulit, dicens, *Semitam ignoravit avis,* &c. De hac solennitate iterum dicit, *Ascendens in altum, captivam duxit captivitatem.* Greg. in evang. hom. 29. [10. vol. I. p. 1573.] And though the Chaldee Paraphrase doth interpret it of Moses, סלקתא לרקיע משה נביא שביתא שביתא אלפתא פתגמי אוריתא, i. e. "Thou hast ascended up to heaven, thou prophet

---

Moses, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast taught the precepts of the law;" [Ps. lxviii. 19.] yet his own translation is a sufficient argument against that interpretation, rendering the Hebrew למרום by לרקיע: for if עלית למרום, "Thou hast ascended on high," be the same with סלקתא לרקיע, "Thou hast ascended to heaven," (as certainly it is,) it cannot possibly be understood of Moses, who is never read to have ascended thither. And besides this, מרום is an expression attributed to none but God; and therefore by this very paraphrast is it rendered שמי מרומא, "the highest heavens," the seat of God alone, Psalm lxxi. 19. xciii. 4: so that none can be said to ascend למרום, but only he who is truly God.

he rode in: what afterwards became of him they could not tell. But to resolve them, the great God, as Christ ascended up to heaven, caused two angels to descend down to earth, to [s] assure them of the place he was carried to, saying to them, *This same Jesus that is taken from you into heaven*; and so shewing them that it was indeed into heaven that he was taken, and [t] comforting them also in this their seeming loss of so good a friend, by telling them that *he shall so come in like manner as they saw him go into heaven.* Though he was gone, he would come again; though they were for the present deprived of his company, yet it was not long but they should enjoy it again, beholding him come down again from heaven to earth, as they now saw him go up from earth to heaven. Thirdly, it is here observable that the apostles saw him ascend[u]: they did not see him when he rose from earth, but they saw him when he ascended to heaven. And indeed there was no need of their seeing him rising, because they were to see him when risen: but there was need they should see him when ascending, because they were to see him no more as yet when once ascended. And therefore it is that he was not immediately snatcht out of their sight, but ascended [x] by degrees; for it is said, *And while they looked stedfastly towards heaven as he went up*, implying that they saw him going farther and farther from them, until he was gone quite out of their sight; and then had messengers presently sent from heaven to acquaint them with his arrival there. Lastly, it is observable from these words, that Christ did not only ascend to heaven then, but remaineth there now, and there shall remain until his second coming. For it is here said, that when he comes from thence he shall descend as he ascended, visibly and apparently to others. Now it is certain, that he did never yet descend so as he then ascended, and therefore must needs be there still, *sitting at the right hand of God until his enemies be made his footstool.* Other proofs from scripture might be brought for it, but these may suffice to shew that the same body wherein Christ arose from the grave he afterwards ascended up to heaven in, where he sitteth until he descend to earth again at the last day.

---

[s] Εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναλαμβάνεται· πολυ δὲ τὸ διάστημα ἦν, καὶ οὐκ ἤρκει ἡ δύναμις τῆς ἡμετέρας ὄψεως σῶμα ἀναλαμβανόμενον ἰδεῖν μέχρι τῶν οὐρανῶν· ἀλλὰ καθάπερ πετεινὸν εἰς ὕψος ἱπτάμενον, ὅσωπερ ἂν εἰς ὕψος ἀνέλθῃ, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ἀποκρύπτεται ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ὄψεως· οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐκεῖνο ὅσωπερ ἂν εἰς ὕψος ἀνῄει, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ἐκρύπτετο, οὐκ ἀρκούσης τῆς ἀσθενείας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν παρακολουθῆσαι τῷ μήκει τοῦ διαστήματος· διὰ τοῦτο παρειστήκεισαν οἱ ἄγγελοι διδάσκοντες τὴν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἄνοδον. Chrysost. hom. de ascens. Domini, [vol. V. p. 600. 28.] Ἐπειδὰν οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ δεῖξαι τὸ ὕψος, οὐδὲ παιδεῦσαι πότερον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνῆλθεν, ἢ ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ὅρα τι γίνεται; ὅτι μὲν αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ᾔδεσαν ἐξ ὧν διελέγετο πρὸς αὐτοὺς (πόρρωθεν γὰρ οὐκ ἐνῆν ἰδόντας γνῶναι) ὅτι δὲ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναλαμβάνεται, αὐτοὶ λοιπὸν ἐδίδασκον οἱ ἄγγελοι. Id. in Act. Apost. hom. 2. vol. iv. p. 618. [27.]

[t] Οὗτος γὰρ, φησὶν, ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οὕτως ἐλεύσεται· ἠλγήσατε, φησὶν, ὅτι ἀνελήφθη; ἀλλὰ μηκέτι ἀλγεῖτε· καὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσεται πάλιν· ἵνα γὰρ μὴ ποιήσωσιν, ὥσπερ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἐλισσαῖος ἰδὼν τὸν διδάσκαλον ἀναλαμβανόμενον, καὶ διαρρήξας τὸν χιτώνισκον (οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶχέ τινα παρεστῶτα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι πάλιν ἥξει Ἡλίας) ἵνα οὖν μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσωσιν οὗτοι, διὰ τοῦτο οἱ ἄγγελοι παρειστήκεισαν παραμυθούμενοι τὴν ἀθυμίαν. Id. hom. de ascensione Domini, [pag. cit.] Cum ergo eum discipuli tanto lumine perculsi non viderent, et curiosos oculos jubar rubidum coruscis ictibus evitaret, confestim ex victoribus angeli directi duo, metu et dolore prostratos apostolos verbis talibus consolantur, *Viri Galilæi quid statis?* &c. Serm. [iv. in ascen. Dom. clxxix. 1. Aug. vol. V. App. p. 304.]

[u] Βλεπόντων μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἀνέστη, βλεπόντων δὲ ἐπήρθη. ἐπειδὰν οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα ἡ ὄψις τὸ πᾶν ἴσχυσε. Καὶ γὰρ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τὸ μὲν τέλος εἶδον, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἔτι. καὶ τῆς ἀναλήψεως τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν εἶδον, τὸ δὲ τέλος οὐκέτι· παρεῖλκε γὰρ ἐκεῖνο τὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἰδεῖν, αὐτοῦ τοῦ ταῦτα φθεγγομένου παρόντος, καὶ τοῦ μνήματος δηλοῦντος, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ· ἀλλὰ τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο λόγῳ ἔδει μαθεῖν. Chrysost. in Acta Apost. hom. 2. vol. IV. p. 618.

And truly there was much reason that Christ should thus ascend to heaven after his resurrection from the grave. For Christ having undertaken to be a Mediator betwixt God and man, there was a threefold office he took upon himself, as so many parts of his Mediatorship, a Priestly, Prophetical, and Kingly office; the first respecting God, the other man. As for the two last, his Kingly and Prophetical office, though he did begin them both, he could finish neither of them upon earth. His Prophetical office could not any other way be perfectly performed for us than by pouring forth of his Spirit upon us; it being part of his Prophetical office to make us to understand his Father's will, as well as to reveal it to us; even not only to explain it to us, but to instruct us in it. Now the only way whereby our understandings are thus enlightened by him, is by receiving his Spirit from him: which

---

[x] Vident hoc præsentes apostoli et paulatim semetipsum ad superna tollentem. Serm. [in ascen. Dom. loc. cit.]

Spirit, himself tells us, was not to be given to us until himself was taken from us: *For if I go not away*, saith he, *the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him to you*, John xvi. 7. So that the Person of Christ was first to ascend from us to God, before the Spirit of Christ was to descend from God to us. And therefore had Christ never ascended to heaven, we had never been instructed upon earth: and so Christ could not have been faithful in discharging his Prophetical office for us, unless he had ascended unto God. No, nor his Kingly office; it being the principal part of his Kingly office to triumph over all his conquered enemies, to gather together his scattered friends, to govern them when gathered, to defend them from their enemies, and to apply those privileges to them which by his own blood he hath purchased for them: all which he could not do till first ascended from them.

We have seen the necessity of Christ's ascension in order to the discharging of his Prophetical and Kingly office; and indeed it was as necessary in regard of his Priestly office too. For the office of the high priest under the law was not only to expiate the sins of the people, but also with the blood of the sin-offering to go into the holy of holies, and there to intercede for them too. And so was Christ (the substance of that shadow) not only to make satisfaction to God's justice for our sins, but also to make intercession to his mercy for our souls. Which part of his Priestly office was only to be performed within the veil in the holy of holies, even in heaven: whither had not Christ ascended, the apostles could never have said, *We have an Advocate with the Father*, 1 John ii. 1: it being only in the court of heaven that this our Advocate was to plead our cause, as before he had shed his blood for us. And hence it is, that supposing Christ to be our Mediator, and so our Prophet, Priest, and King, (which no Christian but will grant,) we must needs confess, that he who rose from death ascended up to heaven, and that [y] he hath the pledge of our flesh there, as we have the pledge of his Spirit here.

---

[y] Hic (Jesus) sequester Dei atque hominum appellatus ex utriusque partis deposito sibi commisso, carnis quoque depositum servat in semetipso, arrhabonem summæ totius. Quemadmodum enim nobis arrhabonem Spiritus reliquit, ita et a nobis arrhabonem carnis accepit,

But now to convince an infidel, Jew or heathen, of this great truth, we must produce our arguments from the miracles which were wrought for the confirmation of it. For as it was by miracles that the gospel was first established by our Saviour in his life, so was it by miracles also that it was propagated by his apostles after his death. It was because he had heard of his miracles that Agbarus [z], king of Edessa, sent to Christ for the cure of his sickness. And it was because of the miracles that were performed that so many kings and kingdoms have since believed in him for the pardon of their sins. Miracles, I say, wrought by his apostles after, as well as by Christ himself before his passion: as, that men that understood no more than one or two languages at the most should immediately understand and speak all manner of languages whatsoever, Acts ii. 4—6: that a man lame from his mother's womb should in the name of Christ be raised up to perfect health and strength by them, Acts iii. 2, 6, 7, 8: that all sick folks, and such as were vexed with unclean spirits, should come to them, and be healed by them, Acts v. 16; so that *by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders done among the people*, ver. 12, which were so convincing to the beholders, that *they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at the*

---

et vexit in cœlum pignus totius summæ illuc quoque redigendæ. Tertull. de resur. carnis, c. 51. [vol. III.]

[z] This Agbarus's letter to Jesus, as also Jesus's answer to him, was found in the place appointed for the keeping of public writings, in Edessa, a city of Arabia; which coming to the view of Eusebius, he hath left them on record for us to read; and that it was the miracles of Christ that made way for the entertainment of the gospel, we may see in this letter to our Saviour. Ἄγβαρος τοπάρχης Ἐδέσσης Ἰησοῦ σωτῆρι ἀγαθῷ, &c. Ἤκουσταί μοι τὰ περί σου καὶ τῶν σῶν ἰαμάτων, ὡς ἄνευ φαρμάκων καὶ βοτανῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ γινομένων· ὡς γὰρ λόγος τυφλοὺς ἀναβλέπειν ποιεῖς, χωλοὺς περιπατεῖν καὶ λεπροὺς καθαρίζεις, καὶ ἀκάθαρτα πνεύματα καὶ δαίμονας ἐκβάλλεις, καὶ τοὺς ἐν μακρονοσίᾳ βασανιζομένους θεραπεύεις, καὶ νεκροὺς ἐγείρεις, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἀκούσας περὶ σοῦ, κατὰ νοῦν ἐθέμην τὸ ἕτερον τῶν δύο· ἢ ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ποιεῖς ταῦτα, ἢ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιῶν ταῦτα. Διὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν γράψας ἐδεήθην σοῦ σκυλῆναι πρός με, καὶ τὸ πάθος ὃ ἔχω θεραπεῦσαι· καὶ γὰρ ἤκουσα ὅτι καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι καταγογγύζουσί σου, καὶ βούλονται κακῶσαί σε· πόλις δὲ μικροτάτη μοί ἐστι, καὶ σεμνὴ, ἥτις ἐξαρκεῖ ἀμφοτέροις. Euseb. hist. eccles. l. 1. c. 13. [vol. I. p. 80.]

least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them, v. 15. So that [a] none can deny but that there were many miracles wrought for the confirmation of this great fundamental truth, and so for the propagation of the gospel that was built upon it. And truly we cannot but grant that the gospel was propagated by miracles; for if it had been propagated without miracles, that would have been the greatest miracle of [b] all. That it was propagated none can deny, so many, not only persons, but whole kingdoms and countries, believing in it and adhering to it. And whether it were propagated with miracles or without miracles, be sure it was a great miracle that it was ever propagated at all; especially considering, first, it was a [c] new doctrine, and a new religion never heard of before; yea, a religion contrary to all other religions whatsoever: which being once brought in, all other religions must be thrown out. The Jews must down with their typical priests, their altars, their sacrifices, and their ceremonies; down with their sabbaths and new moons and passover. The Gentiles must cease worshipping the sun, moon, and stars, believing all their former gods to be no gods, but idols; and that one Christ that was crucified at Hierusalem was the only true God. Secondly, it was a strange doctrine, beyond the reach of human reason to comprehend, or indeed to conceive: as, that in the Trinity there should be three Persons, and yet but one nature; in Christ two natures, and yet but one Person. That a virgin should bring forth a son, and yet remain a virgin still: that he that made the virgin should be made of her: and he become a man in time who had been God from eternity. That this Christ should come into the world to save it, and yet was himself condemned by it, and that his being condemned by it was the way whereby to save it. That *he that finds his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life shall find it*, even such a life wherein he expects to labour continually, and yet hopes to rest unto all eternity. Nay, thirdly, it was not only a doctrine above reason, but contrary to flesh and blood; a doctrine that none can truly embrace, but he must forsake all his former sins, and commence holy. The covetous must become liberal; the drunkard sober; the glutton temperate; the impatient thankful; the rebellious obedient; the malicious loving, not only to his friends, but his very enemies: this, this is the religion that was propagated. And by whom was it propagated? Even by a company of silly fishermen, [d] who had neither authority to command, eloquence to persuade, nor power to constrain any one into the embracement and profession of it. So that whether we will or no, the premises considered, we must be forced to conclude that there was something more than ordinary in the business; even that Christ, which they had so much success in the preaching of, was faithful to the promise he had made them, when amongst them, to be *with them unto the end of the world;* though not in his Person, yet by his Spirit, which being ascended up to his Father in heaven, he sent down to his apostles upon earth, to furnish them with all graces whatsoever requisite for that work they were to be engaged in; and not only thus to enable them to preach the gospel to the world, but also to prepare the world to receive the gospel from them. All which none certainly can think the apostles could do on earth, had they not had continual supplies of grace from Christ in heaven. Which things are [e] a clear argument, both that Christ is risen and ascended into heaven, and that he there sitteth, governing, protecting, and prospering his church on earth still, as he [f] enabled his apostles to propagate it at first.

---

[a] Nam facta esse multa miracula quæ attestarentur illi uni grandi salubrique miraculo, quo Christus in cælum cum carne in qua resurrexit, ascendit, negare non possumus. Aug. de civit. Dei, l. 22. c. 8. [1. vol. VII. p. 663.]

[b] Si ergo per apostolos Christi ut eis crederetur resurrectionem atque ascensionem prædicantibus Christi, etiam ista miracula facta esse non credant; hoc nobis unum grande miraculum sufficit, quod ea terrarum orbis sine ullis miraculis credidit. Ibid. c. 5. [p. 660.]

[c] *Αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν μάλιστα τὸ θαυμαστόν μοι λέγεις, ὅτι διπλῆ ἡ καινοτομία, καὶ τὸ τοὺς ὄντας καθαιρεῖν, καὶ τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ἀναγγέλλειν· πόθεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐπῆλθε τοιαῦτα κηρύττειν; πόθεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τέλους αὐτῶν θαρρεῖν; τίνας τῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν τοιουτόν τι κατωρθωκότας εἶχον ἰδεῖν; οὐ πάντες δαίμονας προσεκύνουν; οὐ πάντες τὰ στοιχεῖα ἐθεοποίουν; οὐ διάφορος ἦν τῆς ἀσεβείας ὁ τρόπος; ἀλλ' ὅμως τὰ πάντα ἐπῆλθον, καὶ κατέλυσαν ταῦτα, καὶ ἐπέδραμον ἐν βραχεῖ καιρῷ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν.* Chrys. in 1 Cor. hom. 4. [vol. III. p. 265. 20.]

---

[d] Ineruditos liberalibus disciplinis, et omnino quantum ad istorum doctrinas attinet impolitos, non peritos grammatica, non armatos dialectica, non rhetorica inflatos, piscatores Christus cum retibus fidei ad mare hujus seculi paucissimos misit, atque ita ex omni genere tam multos pisces, et tanto mirabiliores quanto rariores ipsos philosophos cepit. Aug. de civitate Dei, l. 22. c. 5. Vid. et Chrys. in 1 Cor. hom. 4.

[e] Μεγίστη γὰρ ὄντως ἀναστάσεως ἀπόδειξις, καὶ τὸν σφαγέντα Χριστὸν τοσαύτην μετὰ θάνατον ἐπιδείξασθαι δύναμιν, ὡς τοὺς ζῶντας ἀνθρώπους

And indeed this is so necessary a truth to be believed, that none can be a Christian and not believe it: and therefore is there scarce any of the Fathers but make mention of it, and give their assent unto it. Let these few speak for all the rest. First, Justin Martyr, who speaks fully both to his ascending into heaven at the first, and his sitting there still. [g] "But that God the Father of all was to bring Christ after his resurrection from the dead to heaven, and to detain him there until he had destroyed the devils that were enemies against him, and that the number of the good and virtuous people that were foreknown to him was accomplished, for whose sakes also he hath not yet finished his decree, (for the consummation of all things,) hear the words of the prophet David, which are on this wise; *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.*" And before him Ignatius said [h], "That Christ rose the third day, the Father raising him up, and conversed with his disciples forty days, and afterwards was taken up to his Father, and sitteth at his right hand, expecting till his enemies be put under his feet." And St. Augustine excellently to the purpose [i]; "For as to his majesty, as to his

---

πεῖσαι, καὶ πατρίδος, καὶ οἰκίας, καὶ φιλῶν, καὶ συγγενῶν, καὶ αὐτῆς ὑπεριδεῖν τῆς ζωῆς ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν ὁμολογίας, καὶ μάστιγας, καὶ κινδύνους, καὶ θάνατον ἀντὶ τῶν παρόντων ἡδέων ἑλέσθαι· ταῦτα γὰρ οὐχὶ νεκροῦ τινος, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ μείναντος, ἀλλ' ἀναστάντος καὶ ζῶντος ἦν τὰ κατορθώματα. Chrysost. hom. in Ignat. [vol. V. p. 503. 29.]

[f] Εἶχον γὰρ τούτων ἁπάντων μείζονα συμμαχίαν τὴν τοῦ σταυρωθέντος καὶ ἀναστάντος δύναμιν. Id. in 1 Cor. hom. 4. [29. loc. cit.]

[g] Ὅτι δὲ ἀγαγεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πάντων Θεὸς μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν αὐτὸν ἔμελλε, καὶ κατέχειν ἕως ἂν πατάξῃ τοὺς ἐχθραίνοντας αὐτῷ δαίμονας καὶ συντελεσθῇ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν προεγνωσμένων αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶν γινομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων, δι' οὓς καὶ μηδέπω τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν πεποίηται· ἐπακούσατε τῶν εἰρημένων διὰ Δάβιδ τοῦ προφήτου, ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα, Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου, κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. Justin. pro Christ. apol. [I. 45. p. 70.]

[h] Καὶ ἀνέστη διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν, ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας συνδιατρίψας τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, ἀνελήφθη πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ περιμένων ἕως ἂν τεθῶσιν οἱ ἐχθρυὶ αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. Ignat. epist. ad Tral. [p. 74.]

[i] Nam secundum majestatem suam, secundum Providentiam, secundum ineffabilem et visibilem gratiam

providence, as to his unspeakable and visible grace, it is fulfilled what was said by him, *Behold I am always with you unto the end of the world.* But as to the flesh which the Word assumed, as to that whereby he was born of the Virgin, as to that whereby he was apprehended by the Jews, whereby he was fastened to the wood, whereby he was taken from the cross, whereby he was wrapped in linen, whereby he was laid in the sepulchre, whereby he was manifested in the resurrection, you shall not always have me with you. Why? Because he conversed as to his bodily presence forty days with his disciples; and they accompanying him, by beholding, not by following, he ascended into heaven, and is not here, for he there sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and here he is." And St. Cyprian to the same purpose saith, "That after he had spent forty days with his disciples, [k] he was then taken up into heaven, a cloud being spread about him, that the human nature which he loved, which he assumed, which he protected from death, he might triumphantly carry to his Father." And St. Gregory [l]; "But our Redeemer, because he did not put off his death he conquered it, and destroyed it by rising again; and manifested the glory of his resurrection by ascending up to heaven." And not long after him Isidorus Hispalensis said [m], "The solemnity of the

---

impletur quod ab eo dictum est, *Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi.* Secundum carnem vero quam Verbum assumpsit, secundum id quod de Virgine natus est, secundum id quod a Judæis comprehensus est, quod ligno confixus, quod de cruce depositus, quod linteis involutus, quod in sepulchro conditus, quod in resurrectione manifestatus, *non semper habebitis me vobiscum.* Quare? Quoniam conversatus est secundum corporis præsentiam quadraginta diebus cum discipulis suis, et eis deducentibus videndo non sequendo ascendit in cœlum, et non est hic; ibi enim sedet ad dextram Patris; et hic est. August. in Johan. tract. 50. [13. vol. III. par. ii. p. 634.]

[k] Tunc in cœlum circumfusa nube sublatus est, ut hominem quem dilexit, quem induit, quem a morte protexit, ad Patrem victor imponeret. Cyprian. de idolor. vanitate, tract. 4. [p. 16.]

[l] Redemptor autem noster quia non distulit (mortem) superavit: eamque resurgendo consumpsit, et resurrectionis suæ gloriam ascendendo declaravit. Greg. in evangel. hom. 29. [vol. I. p. 1572.]

[m] Ascensionis dominicæ solennitas ideo celebratur, quia in eodem die, post mundi victoriam, post inferni regressum, Christus ascendisse memoratur ad cœlos, sicut dixit *Ascendit in altum, captivam duxit captivitatem, dedit dona hominibus.* Quæ festivitas ideo per revolutum circulum annorum celebratur, ut humanitas assumptæ carnis ascendentis ad dexteram patris in me-

ascension of our Lord is therefore celebrated, because upon that day, after his victory over the world, after his return from hell, Christ is recorded to have ascended into heaven, as it is written, *He ascended on high, he led captivity captive, he gave gifts to men.* Which festivity is therefore celebrated every year, that the humanity of the assumed flesh, which ascended to the right hand of the Father, might be remembered; whose body is believed to be now in heaven, as it was when it ascended." And hence we dare not but believe with St. Basil[n], "That Christ, after he had risen from the dead the third day, according to the scriptures, he was seen of his holy disciples and the rest, as it is written, and he *ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, from whence he will come at the end of the world to raise up all men, and to give to every one according to his works.*" And so that *Christ did truly rise from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all men at the last day.*

---

moriam revocetur, cujus corpus ita in cœlo esse creditur ut erat quando ascendit. Isidor. Hispal. de eccles. offic. lib. I. cap. [32. p. 591.]

[n] *Καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, ὤφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ὡς γέγραπται· ἀνέβη τε εἰς οὐρανοὺς καὶ κάθηται ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅθεν ἔρχεται ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἀναστῆσαι πάντας καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ.* Basil. de vera fide. [vol. II. p. 389.]

ARTICLE V.

OF THE HOLY GHOST.

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

OF the three Persons in the sacred Trinity, every one of which is God, and yet all but one God, the two first have been already considered. I say the two first[a], not in nature or time, but order; for as to their nature one is not better or more God than another, neither as to time is one before another, none of them being measured by time, all of them and every one of them being eternity itself. But though not in nature or time, yet in order one must needs be before another. For the Father is of himself, receiving his essence neither from the Son nor the Spirit, and therefore must needs be in order before both Son and Spirit; the Son received his essence from the Father but not from the Spirit, and therefore must needs be in order before the Spirit, as well as after the Father; but the Spirit received his essence both from the Father and the Son, and therefore must needs be in order after both Father and Son. Hence it is that the Father is called the first, the Son the second, the Holy Ghost the third Person in the Holy Trinity. Which order is observed by St. John; *There be three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost*, 1 John v. 7. And by our

---

[a] Ὡς γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς, τάξει μὲν δεύτερος τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅτι ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνου· καὶ ἀξιώματι, ὅτι ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία τοῦ εἶναι αὐτοῦ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ ὅτι δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἡ πρόοδος καὶ προσαγωγὴ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα· φύσει δὲ οὐκέτι δεύτερος, διότι ἡ θεότης ἐν ἑκατέρῳ μία· οὕτω δηλονότι καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰ καὶ ὑποβέβηκε τὸν υἱὸν τῇτε τάξει καὶ τῷ ἀξιώματι (ἵν᾽ ὅλως καὶ συγχωρήσωμεν) οὐκέτ᾽ ἂν εἰκότως, ὡς ἀλλοτρίας ὑπάρχον φύσεως. Basil. adv. Eunom. l. 3. [vol. I. p. 751.]

Saviour himself, *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,* Matt. xxviii. 19. And of these three, the two first in order being considered in the four preceding articles, the third is set down in this: of whom it is here said, that he, *proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance and glory with the Father and the Son.*

The Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son: which last words, (*and the Son,*) as they were inserted into the Constantinopolitan Creed by our ancestors in these Western churches, (which [b] was the occasion of the vast schism betwixt them and the Eastern,) so are they here inserted into the articles of our faith, both to shew the constancy of our church in so great a truth, and to keep her children still constant and faithful to it. And though this the Spirit's procession from the Son be not expressly delivered in the scriptures as the procession from the Father is, John xv. 26, yet is the substance and purport of it virtually contained in the scriptures, and may clearly be deduced from them; for as he is called *the Spirit of the Father*, Matt. x. 20, so is he called the *Spirit of the Son*, Gal. iv. 6, and *the Spirit of Christ*, Rom. viii. 9. 1 Pet. i. 11, and *the Spirit of Jesus Christ*, Phil. i. 19. Now why is he called *the Spirit of the Father*, but because he proceedeth from the Father? And how therefore could he be called *the Spirit of the Son*, unless he proceeded from the Son also? Hence also it is that as the Father is said to send the Spirit, John xiv. 26, so is the Son also said to send the Spirit, chap. xv. 26. xvi. 7. The Father is said to send the Spirit, because the Spirit proceeds from the Father; for the right of the Father's mission of the Spirit is grounded upon his communication of his essence to him. And by consequence, the Father sending the Spirit, therefore because the Spirit proceeds from the Father, the Spirit must needs proceed from the Son also, because the Son also is said to send the Spirit; for if the Son also did not communicate his essence to him, and so he proceed from the Son, the Son would have no relation at all to him, much less any right of mission over him.

---

[b] The first general council assembled at Nice, an. Dom. 325, having composed an excellent creed, or rule of faith, (which in the eighth Article, God willing, we shall treat of,) and having said no more in it concerning the Holy Ghost, than *καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, and* (we believe) *in the Holy Ghost*, there being another general council about fifty years after, held at Constantinople, they thought good, for the better suppressing of the heresy of Macedonius, who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, to confirm the same creed, with this addition amongst others to it, *καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον.* Which creed, with this addition, the next general council at Ephesus, an. Dom. 431, not only continued, but also denounced an anathema against all such as should make any more additions to it. Yet notwithstanding the controversy being started in the Western churches, Whether the Spirit proceed from the Son or no, as well as from the Father, the eighth council at Toledo in Spain, an. Dom. 653, debating the question, and carrying it in the affirmative, they, after those words in the Constantinopolitan Creed, *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς*, put in *καὶ υἱοῦ*, and so made it run in Latin, Credimus et in Spiritum Sanctum, dominum, vivificatorem, ex Patre Filioque procedentem; and not only so, but they caused this Creed, so enlarged and altered by them, to be put into their public liturgies, and so sung continually in their churches, the French joining with them, and afterwards the English too, as we may see in our public Liturgy. But in the council held at Akens, in Germany, the matter was after debate referred to pope Leo the Third, but he was so far from allowing of that addition, that he desired it might by degrees be quite left out of the Creed. For the legates being come from the

council to him, we find in the Acts of the said council one of them saying to him, Ergo ut video illud a vestra paternitate decernitur, ut primo illud, de quo quæstio agitur, de sæpe fato symbolo tollatur: et tunc demum a quolibet licite et libere, sive cantando, sive tradendo, discatur et doceatur: to whom Leo answers, Ita proculdubio a nostra parte decernitur; ita quoque ut a vestra assentiatur, a nobis omnibus modis suadetur. [vol. IV. p. 973.] And that a true copy of the said Creed, without any such addition to it, might be recorded and perpetuated, he caused it to be graven in Greek and Latin upon silver plates, and placed in the church for every one to read. So Lombard: Leo tertius (symboli illius) transcriptum in tabula argentea post altare beati Pauli posita posteris reliquit, pro amore, ut ipse ait, et cautela fidei orthodoxæ. In quo quidem symbolo in processione Spiritus Sancti solus commemoratur Pater his verbis, *et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum vivificatorem, ex Patre procedentem*. Sent. l. I. dist. II. [p. 27.] But afterwards these tables were neglected, and pope Nicholas the First caused this clause, *Filioque*, to be added again to the Creed, and so to be read in all the churches under his power. But Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, condemned him for it: and in the council of Constantinople, an. Dom. 879, it was declared that the addition should be quite taken away again; and after that Cerularius, Theophylact, and the Grecians generally, inveighed against it. For which the popes of Rome branded them, and so all the Greek churches, with heresy. And so the quarrel betwixt the Greek and Latin, or Eastern and Western churches, began and hath been continued: the Eastern churches condemning the Western for inserting the clause *Filioque* into the Creed of a general council without the consent of the like authority; the Western churches, on the other hand, condemning the Eastern for keeping it out.

And indeed I cannot see in reason as well as scripture how the Spirit can be denied to proceed from the Son as well as from the Father. For the Father in begetting of the Son communicated his whole essence and nature to him, so that whatsoever the Father is or hath, as God, that hath the Son also: only with this personal distinction, that the Father hath all things not only in himself, but of himself also, whereas the Son hath all things though in himself, yet not of himself, but only by communication from the Father. Now the Son receiving from the Father whatsoever the Father is in himself, and being every way the same God with the Father, he must needs issue forth the Spirit from himself, as well as the Father doth from himself. For the Spirit doth not proceed from the Father as he is a Father, (for then he would be a Son too as well as the Word,) but only as he is God. And therefore the Son being God as well as the Father, (though not a father,) the Spirit must needs proceed from him as well as from the Father: only with this distinction, that the Father hath the Spirit proceeding from him of himself, but the Son hath the Spirit proceeding from him of the [c] Father, who communicating his own individual essence, and so whatsoever he is, (his paternal relation to him excepted,) to the Son, could not but communicate this to him also, even to have the Spirit proceeding from him, as he hath it proceeding from himself. So that as whatsoever else the Father hath originally in himself, the Son hath also by communication from the Father, so hath the Son likewise this, the Spirit's proceeding from him, by communication from the Father, as the Father hath the Spirit proceeding from him originally in himself. Neither is our church singular in this assertion, that the Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father; for the ancient Fathers of the church of Christ did generally teach the same: the Latin [d] Fathers expressly avouching it, that the Spirit did in plain terms proceed both from the Father and Son. And the [e] Greek Fathers, though they do not expressly deliver that he proceeds from the Son, (because the scriptures do not expressly assert it,) yet they say that he [f]receiveth from the Son, that he is [g]the Spirit of the Son, [h]the Word of the Son, yea, [i]God of the Son; plainly implying that what he hath is communicated from the Son as well as from the Father, which is the same thing that

---

[c] Si enim quicquid habet, de Patre habet Filius; de Patre utique habet ut de illo procederet Spiritus Sanctus. Aug. de Trin. l. 15. c. 26. [47. vol. VIII. p. 1000.] Nec de quo genitum est Verbum, nec de quo procedit principaliter Spiritus Sanctus, nisi Deus Pater. Ideo autem addidi principaliter, quia et de Filio Spiritus Sanctus procedere reperitur. Sed hoc quoque illi Pater dedit, non jam existenti et nondum habenti, sed quicquid unigenito Verbo dedit, gignendo dedit. Sic ergo eum genuit, ut etiam de illo donum commune procederet, et Spiritus Sanctus Spiritus esset amborum. Ibid. c. 17. [29. p. 988.]

---

[d] Spiritus autem Sanctus vere Spiritus est procedens quidem a Patre et Filio, sed non est ipse Filius, quia non generatur, neque Pater quia procedit ab utroque. Ambros. de symb. c. 3. [vol. II. App. p. 322.] Filius autem de Patre natus est, et Spiritus Sanctus de Patre principaliter, et ipso sine ullo temporis intervallo dante, communiter de utroque procedit. Aug. de Trinit. l. 15. c. 26. [47.] Spiritus autem Sanctus non de Patre procedit ad Filium, et de Filio procedit ad sanctificandam creaturam, sed simul de utroque procedit: quamvis hoc Pater Filio dederit, ut quemadmodum de se ita de illo quoque procedat. Ibid. c. 27. [48.]

> —et in servos cœlestia dona profudit,
> Spiritum ab unigena Sanctum et Patre
> procedentem.

Paulin. in nat. 9. S. Felic. [Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. VI. p. 287.] Cum enim constat quia Paracletus Spiritus a Patre semper procedit et Filio, cur se Filius recessurum dicit ut ille veniat qui a Filio nunquam recedit? Gregor. Dialog. l. 2. c. 38. [vol. II. p. 276.] Patrem quoque confiteri ingenitum, Filium genitum, Spiritum autem Sanctum nec genitum nec ingenitum, sed ex Patre Filioque procedentem. Isidor. Hispal. Eccles. offic. l. 2. c. [23. vol. I. p. 611.] Audi manifestius, proprium Patris esse genuisse, et proprium Filii natum fuisse, proprium vero Spiritus Sancti procedere, de Patre Filioque. Vigil. contra Eut. l. 1. [Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. VIII. p. 724.] Proprium est Spiritus Sancti quod nec ingenitus, nec genitus est, sed a Patre et Filio æqualiter procedens. Alcuin. de Deo. [p. 761.] Nec alius est qui genuit, alius qui genitus est, alius qui de utroque processit. Leo Epist. [XV. vol. I. p. 450.] Neque Spiritum S. accipimus ut aut Pater sit aut Filius, sed ingenitum Patrem, et de Patre genitum Filium, et de Patre et Filio procedentem Spiritum Sanctum, unius credimus esse substantiæ et essentiæ. Eugen. de cathol. fid. [Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. VIII. p. 683.]

> Qui noster Dominus, qui tuus unicus
> Spirat de patrio corde Paracletum.

Prudent. Hymn. 5. [Cathemer. 159. vol. I. p. 41.] De Spiritu autem S. nec tacere oportet nec loqui necesse est; sed sileri a nobis, eorum causa qui nesciunt, non potest. Loqui autem de eo non necesse est, quia de Patre et Filio autoribus confitendus est, Hilar. de Trin. l. 2. [29. p. 802.] Spiritum cum Deo Patre et Filio esse credo, Deum unius substantiæ, unius quoque naturæ, nec tamen genitum vel creatum, sed a Patre Filioque procedentem amborum esse Spiritum. Pelegrin. in symb. [vol. XVII. p. 456. Bibl. Max. Patr.] Spiritum vero sanctum nec creatum, nec genitum, sed procedentem ex Patre et Filio profitemur. Concil. Tolet. IV. c. 1. [vol. III. p. 579.] Spiritum quoque Sanctum, qui est tertia in Trinitate persona, unum et æqualem cum Deo Patre et Filio credimus esse Deum, unius substantiæ unius quoque naturæ: non tamen genitum vel creatum, sed ab utrisque procedentem, amborum esse spiritum. Concil. Tolet. XI. Expos. fid. [Ibid. p. 1020.] Et quos susceperunt suscipimus, glorificantes Deum Patrem, sine initio, et Filium ejus unigenitum ex Patre generatum ante secula, et Spiritum Sanctum procedentem ex Patre et Filio inenarrabiliter sicut prædicaverunt hi quos memoravimus supradicti sancti apostoli et prophetæ et doctores. Synod. Anglic. apud Bed. Hist. Eccles. l. 4. c. 17. [p. 161.] V. et Acta concil. Forojul. an. 791. [vol. IV. p. 847.] Fideli ac devota professione fatemur quod Spiritus Sanctus eternaliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis sed tanquam ex uno, non duabus spirationibus, sed una spiratione procedit. Concil. Lugdun. II. [gen.] in decretal. [vol. VII. p. 705.]

[e] I confess in the creed attributed

---

to Athanasius, it is expressly said in the Latin, (for in the Greek there is no such thing,) Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio non factus nec creatus nec genitus est sed procedens. But we cannot deduce any certain argument from thence, that Athanasius was of that opinion, because it is doubted by some whether he was the author of that creed or no; or if he was, it is probable that clause might be inserted by others into this, as it was into the Constantinopolitan creed. And that he was not of that judgment, we may perceive from his never mentioning it in any other place, though he disputes so often about the Deity, and procession of the Spirit. Especially it is probable he would have mentioned it (if he had held it) in the rule of his faith which he delivered in the council of Nice, or, be sure, in some place or other of his writings; but though he speaks often of the procession of the Spirit from the Father, he never mentions any procession from the Son. But of this more hereafter.

[f] Τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἀεὶ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, οὐκ ἀλλότριον Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ δὲ Θεοῦ ὂν, ἀπὸ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον. Epiphan. in Ancor. c. 6. [vol. II. p. 11.] Ὃν γὰρ τρόπον οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, οὕτω τολμῶ λέγειν ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ πνεῦμα εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς, παρ᾽ οὗ ἐκπορεύεται, παρ᾽ οὗ λαμβάνει. Ibid. c. 67. [vid. c. 11. Ibid. vol. II. p. 16. et c. 67. p. 71.] Ἑνὸς γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος λόγου, μίαν εἶναι δεῖ τελείαν καὶ πλήρη τὴν ἁγιαστικὴν καὶ φωτιστικὴν ζωὴν, οὖσαν ἐνεργείαν αὐτοῦ καὶ δωρεὰν, ἥτις γε ἐκ πατρὸς λέγεται ἐκπορεύεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ παρὰ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἐκ πατρὸς ὁμολογουμένου ἐκλάμπει, καὶ ἀποστέλλεται, καὶ δίδοται. Athan. ad Serap. de Spir. S. [vol. I. p. 669.] where the interpreter translates ἐκλάμπει *desumit;* whence we may conjecture for it he read ἐκλαμβάνει. And that *accipere* and *procedere* signify the same thing in the procession of the Holy Ghost, St. Hilary expressly: Omnia quæcunque habet Pater mea sunt, propterea dixi, *De meo accipiet et annunciabit vobis.* A Filio igitur accipit qui et ab eo mittitur et a Patre procedit: et interrogo utrum id ipsum sit a Filio accipere quod a Patre procedere. Quod si nihil differre creditur inter accipere a Filio et a Patre procedere, certe id ipsum atque unum esse existimabitur a Filio accipere quod sit accipere a Patre. Ipse enim Dominus ait Quoniam de meo accipiet, &c. Hilar. de Trinit. l. 8. [20. p. 959.]

[g] Ὄνομα δὲ αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πνεῦμα ἀληθείας, πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, πνεῦμα Κυρίου, πνεῦμα τοῦ Πατρὸς, πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ, πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ. Chrys. de Spiritu S., vol. VI. p. 730.

[h] Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Θεοῦ μὲν Λόγος ὁ υἱὸς, ῥῆμα δὲ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα. Basil. contra Eunom. l. 5. [vol. I. p. 787.]

[i] Ἆρα Θεὸς ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα ᾧ ἐψεύσαντο οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ τιμήματος νοσφισάμενοι. Epiphan. in Ancor. c. 9. [vol. II. p. 14.] Εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς πιστεύεται Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ παρ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Χριστὰς, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται καὶ οὗτος ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται. Ibid. c. 67. [p. 70.] Where we may observe, he doth not only assert the Spirit to be God, of the Son and the Father, as the Son is God of the Father only, but also grounds this his assertion upon that scripture, *he shall receive of mine.*

the others understood by his proceeding from the Father and Son.

This Holy Ghost, thus *proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son;* so that as the Son doth so receive his Divine essence from the Father, as to be the selfsame individual God with the Father; so doth the Spirit receive his essence from the Father and Son, as to be of one substance and glory with the Father and Son. The Father did not communicate another, but his own numerical or individual nature to the Son, and so both Father and Son being of one nature betwixt themselves communicate that their nature to the Spirit; by which means though he proceed from both, and so is a distinct Person from both, yet he hath the same nature and substance with both, and so is as truly that one God which we worship and adore, as either or both of them. Insomuch that as though the Father be the root, origin, and fountain of Deity to the Son, and yet the Son hath as much of the Divine nature in him as the Father; so here though it be from the Father and the Son that the Spirit doth proceed, yet he hath the Divine nature in him as perfectly as either of them, and so is truly and eternally God, that one God blessed for evermore, which angels and men are bound continually to worship and adore.

And that the Holy Ghost is thus *very and eternal God* is frequently asserted by himself in the holy scriptures which himself indited. Indeed his inditing of the scriptures is a clear argument of his Deity, as well as the scriptures which were indited by him. What man, what creature, who but God, could compose such articles of faith, and enjoin such divine precepts as are in the scriptures expressed? Neither doth his inditing of the scriptures only, but the scriptures that were indited by him also give a full testimony unto this truth. Nay, the scriptures do therefore testify that the Spirit is God, because they do testify that themselves were written by that God who is a Spirit; and that it was the Lord Jehovah that spake by the prophets, and other writers of the Word of God; himself saying, *Hear now my words: If there be a prophet amongst you, I the Lord* (*Jehovah*) *will make myself known* *unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream*, Num. xii. 6. And hence it is that the prophets so frequently cry out, *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts*, to wit, because what they speak from the Lord of Hosts, the Lord of Hosts had first spoken unto them. Now who was this Lord of Hosts that thus spake by the prophets, and instructed the penmen of the scriptures what to write? Was it God the Father or God the Son? No, but it was God the Holy Ghost: *For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*, 2 Pet. i. 21. It was the Holy Ghost that spake by the prophets, and therefore it must needs be he the prophets mean when they say, *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts*. So that he that bade them say, *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts* in the Old Testament, hath also discovered who is the Lord of Hosts in the New, even it is the Spirit of God that was this *Lord of Hosts*, and being the Lord of Hosts he must needs be God; there being no person that is or can be called the Lord of Hosts but he that is the very and eternal God.

This truth is also unveiled to us in these words, *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* 1 Cor. iii. 16. None can be the temple of God but he in whom God himself dwells; for it is God's dwelling in a place that makes that place the temple of God; and whosoever else dwells in it, unless God himself dwells in it, it is no temple. Now we are here said to be *the temple of God*, and that because *the Spirit of God dwelleth in us;* we know we are the temple of God if God dwelleth in us, and that God dwelleth in us if we be the temple of God, and the God that dwelleth in us, and so makes us the temple of God, is here said to be *the Spirit of God*. As also in these words, *What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?* 1 Cor. vi. 19. And [k] therefore the Spirit of God must needs himself be God; none can have a temple but God, but the Holy Ghost hath a temple, and therefore the Holy Ghost is God.

---

[k] Ποῦ γὰρ ἔτι θεοὶ καὶ ναοὶ Θεοῦ ἔσμεν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς διὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν; τὸ γάρ τοι τοῦ εἶναι Θεὸς τητώμενον, πῶς ἂν ἐνθείη τὸ χρῆμα ἑτέροις; ἀλλὰ μὴν ἔσμεν ναοὶ καὶ θεοί. Προσεκτέον δὲ οὔτι ποῦ τοῖς πεπλανημένοις· οὐχ ἑτερούσιον ἄρα πρὸς Θεὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ. Cyril. Alex. de S. Trinit. Dial. 7. [vol. V. par. i. p. 640.]

But one of the clearest discoveries of this great truth is made in the story of Ananias and Sapphira, recorded Acts v. where Peter propounds this question to Ananias, *Why hath Satan filled thy heart*[1] *to lie to the Holy Ghost?* and tells him in the next verse, *Thou hast not lied to men, but God;* by which words the apostle plainly shews that Ananias lied, and that he lied not to men only but to the Holy Ghost, and that in lying to the Holy Ghost he lied not to any creature, but to God himself, and so that the Holy Ghost to whom he lied is the very and eternal God, otherwise, though he had lied to him, he would not have lied to God.

But beside such places of scripture wherein it hath pleased the Holy Ghost expressly to call himself God, there are several other scriptures which reason will gather this truth from; all, or the most of which we may crowd together into this or the like syllogism: He that is the same in essence that the Father or Son is, hath the same worship that the Father or Son hath, and doth the same works as the Father or Son as God doth, is himself the very and eternal God as well as either Father or Son. But the Holy Ghost is the same in essence that the Father or Son is, hath the same worship due to him as the Father or Son hath, and doth the same works that the Father or Son as God doth: therefore the Holy Ghost is the very and eternal God. The first of these propositions is unquestionable, and the last is undeniable, and therefore it is the second only that requires proof, to wit, that the Holy Ghost is, hath, and doth, whatsoever the Father or Son is, hath, or doth. First, the Holy Ghost is in essence the same that the Father and Son is. For the essence and the properties of God are not at all distinguished, so that as whosoever hath the essence cannot but have the properties, so whosoever hath the properties cannot but have the essence of God: now the same essential properties that are attributed to the Father and Son are ascribed also to the Spirit in the holy scriptures. Is the Father and Son holy? so is the Spirit; who therefore is so frequently called the Holy Ghost; holy not as creatures are, secondarily, derivatively, finitely holy, but so as none but God himself is, essentially, originally, infinitely holy; so that we may conclude the Holy Ghost to be God upon that very account, because he is the [m] Holy Ghost. Again, is the Father and Son eternal? so is the Spirit: for *Christ through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God*, Heb. ix. 14. Is God the Father and the Son everywhere? so is the Spirit; for, *whither shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence?* Ps. cxxxix. 7. Is God the Father and Son a wise, understanding, powerful and knowing God? so is the Spirit too; *he is the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord*, Isa. xi. 2. Secondly, as the same properties are ascribed, so is the same worship to be performed to the Spirit that is to be performed to the Father and Son as God. As we are to pray to the Father and pray to the Son, so are we to pray to the Spirit also; as we are baptized in the name of the Father and in the name of the Son, so are we baptized in the name of the Spirit also; for thus saith our Saviour, *Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, Matt. xxviii. 19. And so in baptism, as we are not baptized only in the name of the Father and of the Son, but also of the Holy Ghost; so in baptism we dedicate ourselves to the worship of the Holy Ghost, as well as of either the Father or Son. And hence it is that we may sin against the Holy Ghost as well as against Father or Son; nay, the sin against this Person only is accounted by our Saviour himself as a sin never to be pardoned, Matt. xii. 31, 32. We may sin against God the Father, and our sin may be pardoned; we may sin against God the Son, and our sin may be pardoned; but if we sin against God the Holy Ghost, that our sin shall never be pardoned. But if the Holy Ghost be not God, how can we sin against him? or how comes our sin against him to be unpardonable unless he be God? I know it is not therefore unpardonable because he is God, for then the sin against the Father and Son would be unpardonable too, they being both God as well as he: but though this sin is not therefore unpardonable because he is God, yet it could not be unpardonable unless he was God. For supposing him not to be God, and yet the sin against him to be unpardonable, then the sin against the creature (as every one is that is not God) would be unpardonable, when the sins against God himself are pardoned; which to say would itself come near, I think, to the sin against the Holy Ghost. But, thirdly, as the same properties and worship which are attributed to the Father and Son are ascribed also to the Spirit, so are the same works likewise performed by the Spirit that are performed either by Father or Son as God. It was he that *moved upon the face of the* [n] *waters*, Gen. i. 2. and so had a hand in the creation of the world. It was by his Spirit that God garnished the heavens, Job xxvi. 13. It is the Spirit that scattereth his gifts, and distributeth his graces amongst the children of men, 1 Cor. xii. 4. It was the Spirit that instructed the prophets, 2 Pet. i. 21. and ordained the apostles, Acts xiii. 2. and appointeth overseers in the church of Christ, Acts xx. 28. Yea, it was by the Spirit of God that Christ cast out devils, Matt. xii. 28. It was the Spirit that wrought miracles then by casting devils out of possessed bodies, and it is he that worketh miracles still by casting sin out of corrupted souls; for it is he that throweth the old man out of us, and maketh all things to become [o] new within us, Tit. iii. 5. All which being throughly considered, the Spirit, that proceedeth from the Father and the Son, cannot but be acknowledged to be the one very and eternal God as well as either Father or Son; and that though he proceed from both, yet as God he is inferior to neither; nay, that he so proceedeth from them both as to be the same individual God with them both.

---

[1] Though the original now hath it *ψεύσασθαί σε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,* yet there is no reason to condemn our translation for rendering it *to lie to the Holy Ghost.* For the dative and accusative cases are here used promiscuously, for we may see the like in Psal. lxvi. 3; where, for the Heb. יכחשו לך i. e. *they shall lie unto thee,* the Septuagint hath *ψεύσονταί σε.* And truly he that condemneth ours, must with it condemn all the most ancient translations of the New Testament, which carry the sense the same way, as if for *τὸ Πνεῦμα* they had read *εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,* as it is in some copies. Thus the Syriac plainly, ܕܬܕܓܠ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ, ut mentireris in Spiritum Sanctum: the Arabic ان تكذب لروح القدس, i. e. ut mentireris in Spiritum Sanctum: and so the Ethiopic, too, ከመ፡ ተሐሰው፡ ለመንፈስ፡ ቅዱስ፡, ut mentireris Spiritui Sancto. Where we see the Syriac using ܒ, the Arabic ل, the Ethiopic ለ, to express *εἰς* by, which seems by that to have been in the copies they made their translations by. Or howsoever they read the words, be sure they render them as we do, *to lie to the Holy Ghost.*

---

[m] Si enim Spiritus sanctus est, quomodo creatura est? Non enim sic sanctus est ut cæteri qui ad *sancti* vocabulum fide et Deo placita conversatione, atque ipsius Sancti Spiritus sanctificatione venerunt, sed ipse naturaliter semper sanctus est, ita ut alios sanctificet. Faustin. de fide, contra Arian. c. 7. [Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. V. p. 650.]

---

[n] Hic Spiritus Sanctus ab ipso mundi initio aquis legitur superfusus, non materialibus aquis quasi vehiculo egens, quas potius ipse ferebat et complectentibus firmamentum dabat congruum motum et limitem præfinitum. Cyprian. de Spiritu S. [ad calc. edit. Oxon. p. 60.]

And this hath been the constant doctrine of the church of Christ in all ages. To begin with Athenagoras [p], who saith, "The Holy Ghost also, that acted those that spake prophetically, we say is a procession or effluxion from God, flowing from him and reflected to him, as a beam of the sun. Who therefore doth not wonder to hear us called atheists, that profess and preach God the Father, God the Son, and Holy Ghost, teaching their power in unity and distinction in order?" viz. that in power, and all other essential properties, they are but one and the same God, but distinguished in their order and relation to one another. And Justin to the same purpose [q]: "But we have the same notion also concerning the Holy Ghost; for as the Son is of the Father, so is the Spirit too, but only that they differ in the manner of their subsisting. For he (the Son) is Light of Light, shining by way of generation. But this (the Spirit) is himself also Light of Light, but not flowing as one begotten but as one proceeding, and so coeternal with the Father, and so the same in essence with him, so impassibly proceeding from him; and so it is that we understand an Unity in Trinity, and acknowledge a Trinity in Unity." And St. Basil[r] clearly; "Seeing those things that are common to the creatures are not communicable to the Holy Ghost, and those things that are proper to the Holy Ghost are not communicable to the creatures, it is hence gathered that the Spirit is not a creature. Seeing what is common to the Father and Son is common also to the Spirit; seeing by the same things that God the Father and the Son are characterised and described in scripture, by the same things is the Holy Ghost characterised and described; it is hence gathered that the Spirit is of the same Deity with the Father. Seeing that whatsoever is in the Father as God only and not as a father, and whatsoever is in the Son as God only and not as a son, the same is also in the Holy Ghost, but not in any creature, as names and things incommunicable to the creatures, common only to the Trinity, it is hence gathered that the Trinity is of one substance and glory." And so Gregory Nyssen[s] saith, "The Holy Ghost hath, in common with the Son and the Father, an uncreated and eternal nature, and is distinguished from them only by his own proper notions or personal properties." And St. Chrysostome, speaking of the Son and the Spirit, saith[t], "There is one nature of the Son and Spirit, one power, one truth, one life, one wisdom." And St. Augustine shews also how the Spirit is so of one nature and substance with the Father and Son, that they are all but one God; [u] "For so the Father is God, and the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and altogether one God; and yet it is not in vain that in this Trinity none of them is called the Word of God but the Son, nor the gift of God but the Holy Ghost." And Maxentius [x] to the same purpose: "The Father is God, the Son, and Holy Ghost is God; not three but one God, one substance or nature, one wisdom, one power, one dominion, one kingdom, one omnipotence, one glory, and yet three subsistences or Persons." I shall conclude this with that of Eugenius [y]: "Let us therefore make a rehearsal of what hath been said: If the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, if he sets at liberty, if he be the Lord and sanctifieth, if he createth with the Father and the Son and quickens, if he hath the same dignity with the Father and the Son, if he be everywhere and filleth all things, if he dwelleth in the elect, if he convinceth the world, if he judgeth, if he be good and upright, if it be said of him, *Thus saith the Holy Ghost*, if he appoints prophets and sends apostles, if he prefers bishops, if he be a comforter, if he orders all things as himself pleaseth, if he washeth and justifieth, if he kills those that tempt him, if he that blasphemeth against him shall have no *forgiveness, neither in this world nor in that which is to come*, which is also proper to God; seeing these things are so, why should it be doubted whether he be God; seeing the greatness of his works manifest him what he is?" even that he *the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.*

---

[o] Τὸ δὴ τὴν κτίσιν ἀνακαινοῦν, καὶ τὴν φθορὰν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν μεταβάλλον, τὸ καινὴν ἡμᾶς κτίσιν ἀπεργαζόμενον διαμένουσαν εἰς αἰῶνα, τίς ἀποστήσει τοῦ δημιουργοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Υἱοῦ; πῶς τὸ τῆς θεότητος ἐκτὸς τὴν τῆς θεότητος κτίσιν ἀνασώζει καινὴν καὶ ἀφθαρτὸν ἀπεργαζόμενον; Basil. adv. Eunom. l. 5. [vol. I. p. 785.]

[p] Καί τοι καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐνεργοῦν τοῖς ἐκφωνοῦσι προφητικῶς ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀπόρροιαν εἶναι φαμὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπορρέον, καὶ ἐπαναφερόμενον ὡς ἀκτῖνα ἡλίου. Τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν ἀπορήσαι, λέγοντας Θεὸν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν Θεὸν, καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, δείκνυντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἑνώσει δύναμιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν, ἀκούσας ἀθεοὺς καλουμένους; Athenag. Πρεσβ. περὶ Χριστ. [10. p. 287.]

[q] Τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ γνῶσιν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος κατέχομεν, ὅτι ὥσπερ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα· πλήν γε δὴ τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς ὑπάρξεως διοίσει. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς γεννητῶς ἐξέλαμψε· τὸ δὲ φῶς μὲν ἐκ φωτὸς καὶ αὐτὸ, οὐ μὴν γεννητῶς ἀλλ᾽ ἐκπορευτῶς προῆλθεν. οὕτως συναΐδιον τῷ Πατρὶ, οὕτως τὴν οὐσίαν ταὐτὸν, οὕτως ἀπαθῶς ἐκεῖθεν ἐκπορευθέν· οὕτως ἐν τῇ τριάδι τὴν μονάδα νοοῦμεν, καὶ ἐν τῇ μονάδι τὴν τριάδα γνωρίζομεν. Just. expos. fid. [9. p. 426.]

---

[r] *Ὅτι τὰ κοινὰ τῆς κτίσεως ἀκοινώνητα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, καὶ τὰ ἴδια τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀκοινώνητα τῇ κτίσει, ἐξ ὧν συνάγεται μὴ εἶναι κτίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα. Ὅτι τὰ κοινὰ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ ταῦτα κοινὰ τῷ Πνεύματι· ὅτι ἐν οἷς χαρακτηρίζεται Θεὸς ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν τῇ γραφῇ ἐν αὐτοῖς χαρακτηρίζεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐξ ὧν συνάγεται τῆς αὐτῆς θεότητος τὸ Πνεῦμα τῷ Πατρί. Ὅτι τὰ μόνῳ προσόντα τῷ Πατρὶ ὡς Θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ὡς Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ ὡς Θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ὡς Υἱῷ, ταῦτα μόνῳ πρόσεστι τῷ Πνεύματι, οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ τῇ κτίσει, ὡς τὰ ἀκοινώνητα ὀνόματα καὶ πράγματα τῇ κτίσει μόνῃ κοινὰ τῇ τριάδι, ἐξ ὧν συνάγεται ὁμοούσιος ἡ τριάς.* Basil. adv. Eunom. l. 5. [vol. I. p. 777.]

[s] *Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν τῷ ἀκτίστῳ τῆς φύσεως τὴν κοινωνίαν ἔχον πρὸς Υἱὸν καὶ Πατέρα, τοῖς ἰδίοις πάλιν γνωρίσμασιν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν διακρίνεται.* Greg. Nyssen. contr. Eunom. l. 1. [vol. II. p. 342.]

[t] *Μία φύσις Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος, μία δύναμις, μία ἀλήθεια, μία ζωὴ, μία σοφία.* Chrysostom. de Spiritu Sanc. [vol. VI. p. 735. 18.]

---

[u] Sic enim et Pater Deus, et Filius Deus, et Spiritus Sanctus Deus, èt simul omnes unus Deus. Et tamen non frustra in hac Trinitate non dicitur verbum Dei nisi Filius, nec donum Dei nisi Spiritus Sanctus. Aug. de Trinit. l. 15. [28, 29. vol. VIII. p. 988.]

[x] Est Deus Pater, Filius, Deus etiam Spiritus Sanctus, non tres sed unus Deus, una substantia sive natura, una sapientia, una virtus, una dominatio, unum regnum, una omnipotentia, una gloria, tres tamen subsistentiæ sive personæ. Maxent. fid. confes. [Biblioth. Max. Patr. vol. IX. p. 537.]

[y] Faciamus ergo recapitulationem dictorum nostrorum. Si de Patre procedit Spiritus Sanctus, si liberat, si Dominus est, et sanctificat, si creat cum Patre et Filio, et vivificat, si præstantiam habet cum Patre et Filio, si ubique est et implet omnia, si habitat in electis, si arguit mundum, si judicat, si bonus et rectus est, si de eo clamatur *hæc dicit Spiritus Sanctus*, si prophetas constituit, si apostolos mittit, si episcopos præficit, si consolator est, si cuncta dispensat prout vult, si abluit et justificat, et tentatores suos interficit, si is *qui eum blasphemaverit, non habet remissionem neque in hoc seculo neque in futuro*, quod utique Deo proprium est; hæc cum ita sint, cur de eo dubitatur quod Deus sit? Cum eum operum magnitudo quod est ipse manifestat. Eugen. de cathol. fide, [Biblioth. Max. Patr. vol. VIII. p. 687.]

ARTICLE VI.

OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES FOR SALVATION.

Holy scripture containeth all things necessary for salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite, or necessary to salvation.

THE eternal God, having by the word of his power commanded the stately fabric of the world out of the womb of nothing, and having furnished the upper part of it, heaven, with understanding spirits, and the lower part of it, earth, with inanimate, vegetative, and sensitive bodies, was pleased after all to make one creature that might participate of both natures, a perfect microcosm, or little world, made up of heaven and earth together, having both a rational spirit like to the angels above, and an earthly body like to the creatures below. This person, being inferior to angels because a body as well as spirit, and superior to all other creatures because a spirit as well as body, God was pleased to set under the one and [a] over the other, as his deputy, or vicegerent, to rule or govern the other creatures he made upon earth, uncapable of ruling or governing of themselves. And that he might behave himself aright both towards God his master, and the creatures his servants, he was throughly instructed with the whole will and pleasure of his Master; neither had he only wisdom to know what he ought constantly to do, but also grace to do what he did so perfectly know. And though by sinning afterwards against God he forfeited the grace he had received from him, and so became unable to do his will, yet was God of his infinite wisdom pleased still to instruct* him with the knowledge of his will, that so though he could not do what he knew, yet he might know what he ought to do. This his will God was pleased in the infancy of the world to write only upon the table of their hearts, for then men living some hundreds, yea, almost a thousand years upon earth, had opportunities and time enough to hand this the will of their God from one to another, that the children might be throughly instructed by their fathers before the fathers were taken from their children; but afterwards the most high God having appointed man a shorter abode here, it pleased him to write his will upon two tables of stone, that we might not only know his will by hearing it reported by others, but by seeing it recorded by God himself. Of these two tables the one contained our duty towards God, the other our duty towards man; but because the knowledge as well as holiness of man was much impaired by his fall from God, and though he could read, he might not perfectly understand his duty, it pleased his sacred Deity to interpret and explain his own will by several histories of things past and prophecies of things to come, and other holy writings, as himself thought fit; all which we call the holy scriptures; which are commonly divided into two parts, the Old and the New Testament.

---

[a] *Δείκνυται γὰρ ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ὅτι ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐκ προοιμίων ἀπηρτισμένην εἶχε τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὴν κατὰ τῶν θηρίων.* Chrys. in Gen. hom. 9. [vol. I. p. 53. 24.] Ad hoc facti sumus ut creaturis cæteris dominaremur: sed per peccatum in primo homine lapsi sumus, et in mortis hæreditatem omnes devenimus. Aug. de symb. ad catechum. c. 1. [2. vol. VI. p. 547.] Quia nimirum in hoc maxime factus est homo ad imaginem Dei, in quo irrationalibus animantibus antecellit, capax videlicet rationis conditus per quam et creata quæque in mundo recte gubernare, et ejus qui cuncta creavit possit agnitione frui: in quo honore positus, si non intellexerit ut bene agat, eisdem animantibus insensatis quibus prælatus est comparabitur, sicut Psalmista testatur. Junil. comment. in Gen. [Biblioth. patr. 1575, vol. VI. p. 38.]

The Old Testament he caused long ago to be written in the Hebrew tongue, a language peculiar to his own people that he had chosen out of the rest of the world, to make known his will in a more especial manner to: amongst whom he was pleased for a long time to raise up prophets one after another, and to inspire them with his Holy Spirit, the better to preserve this his will amongst themselves, and to explain it unto others. But intending to withdraw this his prophetical Spirit from them, presently after their return from the Babylonian captivity, he caused Ezra, who was also called, as some think[b], Malachi, and other prophets and holy men assembled in a [c]council, called by the Jews the Great Synagogue, besides other things, to number not only the books, but the verses, words, and letters also of this his will, and to leave them on record to posterity, that so, though the spirit of prophecy was taken from them, the whole will of God might be exactly and constantly[d] preserved amongst them; which work the Jews, and from them the Christians too, call the Masora, whereby it is impossible that a verse, word, or tittle should be altered in the Hebrew text, but it would presently be discovered; and so we may be sure that that Hebrew text which we now have, is the selfsame text that Ezra and the other prophets used so long before our Saviour's time. After whose coming the great God commanded other books to be written in the Greek language, and to be annexed to the former written in the Hebrew; and these are they which we term the New Testament, which together with the Old are called the holy scripture.

---

* MS. *intrust.*

---

[b] This we read in the Targum itself upon the prophecy of Malachi, מטל פתגמא דיי על ישראל ביד מלאכי דיתקרי שמיה עזרא ספרא, *The burden of the word of the Lord by the hand of Malachi, who is called Ezra the Scribe*, Mal. i. 1. Targ. And Ab. Ezra, in his preface to his book [?] called Masoreth Hammasoreth, saith, עלה עזרא הוא מלאכי, *Ezra ascended, which is Malachi.* From whence St. Hierome observeth, Malachi autem Hebræi Ezram existimant sacerdotem. Hieronym. in Malach. [vol. VI. p. 939.]

[c] When the Jews were returned from their Babylonish captivity, for the restoring their law and religion to its former glory and lustre, Ezra and other prophets and holy men met together in a general council, called of themselves כנסת הגדולה, i. e. "The great assembly, or synagogue," to consult about it. The names of such as met, Abarbinel gives us this account of: Catalogus virorum synagogæ magnæ sunt Haggai propheta, Zacharias propheta, Malachias propheta, Zorobabel filius Shealtiel, Mordechai Bilshan, Ezra sacerdos et scriba, Joshua filius Jozedek sacerdotis, Seraia, Realia, Mispar Bigvæus, Rachum Baana, Nehemiah filius Chachiliæ. Hi sunt duodecim principales nominibus suis notati, qui ex Babylone Hierosolymam ascenderunt in principio templi secundi, quibus præterea sapientes alii ex principalioribus populi Israel adjuncti fuere, usque ad numerum centum et viginti virorum, qui vocati sunt viri synagogæ magnæ, et appellati sunt sic quia congregati fuerunt ad ordinandas constitutiones bonas, ad recte dirigendum populum, ולהחזיק את ברק התורה et ad restaurandas rupturas legis. Abarb. in præf. ad נחלות אבות. [fol. ד. et vid. Buxt. Tiber. p. 95.]: and so R. Abraham Ben David in L. Kab. Historicæ. But besides these here particularly named, they say that Simeon Justus was also of the said council: בית דינו של עזרא הם הנקראים אנשי כנסת הגדולה והם הגי זכריה ומלאכי וכו״ והרבה חכמים עמהם תשלים מאה ועשרים זקנים ואחר מהם הוא שמעון העדיק והוא היה מכלל המאת ועשרים; i. e. "The house of the council of Ezra they were of who are called the men of the great synagogue, and they were Haggai, Zachariah, Malachi, &c. and many other wise men with them, to the completing the number of one hundred and twenty; and last of all Simeon the Just, he was also of the number of the hundred and twenty." R. Mos. Ben Maim. præf. ad lib. יד. [vol. I. fol. ב.] These being all met together determined the number of canonical books, distinguished the scripture into verses, examining the several copies they had of the original, and comparing them together, declared what words were read but not written, or written but not read, whence arose the *Keri* and *Chetib*: and they numbered every word, letter, and verse of every book, set down which was the middle verse or middle word of the book, and how oft such or such words were used. All which they called the Masora, that is, tradition; because, as they say, משה קבל תורה מסיני ומסרה· ליהושע ויהושע לזקנים וזקנים לנבאים ונבאים מסרוה לאנְשי כנסת הגדולה, [Abarb. Ibid. fol. ב. vers.] i. e. Moses accepit legem de Sinai et tradidit eam Joshuæ, Joshua senibus, senes prophetis, prophetæ tradiderunt eam viris synagogæ magnæ. Apophtheg. Patr. c. 1. And from this were they

This holy scripture thus written in Hebrew and Greek, in those languages wherein it was written, containeth nothing but the will of God, and the whole will of God; so that there is nothing necessary to be believed concerning God, nor done in obedience unto God by us, but what is here revealed to us;

---

of this council afterwards called Masorethæ. This is that which St. Chrysostome seems to have reference to, when he saith, *Νυνὶ δὲ οὐδὲ ὅτι γραφαὶ εἰσὶν ἴσασί τινες; καίτοι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοσαῦτα ᾠκονόμησεν, ὥστε αὐτὰς φυλαχθῆναι. Καὶ ὁρᾶτε ἄνωθεν ἵνα μάθητε τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἄφατον φιλανθρωπίαν. ἐνέπνευσε τῷ μακαρίῳ Μωϋσεῖ, τὰς πλάκας ἐκόλαψε. κατέσχεν αὐτὸν τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους, καὶ πάλιν τοσαύτας ἑτέρας ὥστε δοῦναι τὸν νόμον· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα προφήτας ἔπεμψε μυρία παθόντας δεινά· ἐπῆλθε πόλεμος, ἀνεῖλον πάντας, κατέκοψαν, ἐνεπρήσθησαν αἱ βίβλοι· ἑτέρῳ πάλιν ἀνδρὶ θαυμαστῷ ἐνέπνευσεν, ὥστε αὐτὰς ἐκθέσθαι τῷ Ἔσδρᾳ λέγω, καὶ ἀπὸ λειψάνων συντεθῆναι ἐποίησε.* Chrysost. in epist. ad Heb. hom. 8. [vol. IV. p. 478. 22.]

[d] This the Jews themselves acknowledge, אחר המעשה אשר עשו בעלי המסורת אי אפשר שנפל או שיפול הלוץ או שנוי בשום צד בכל ספרי המקרא ולא לחנם אמרו רזל״ מסורת סיג לתורה, i.e. Post opus illud quod Masorethæ præstiterunt, impossibile est quod inciderit aut incidere possit ulla varietas aut mutatio in posterum in ullis libris scripturæ: nec frustra dixerunt rabbini nostri memoriæ benedictæ Masora est sepes legis. Elias Lev. orat. 3. lib. Hammasoreth. [p. כז.] And so Ab. Ezra, האמת כי יש שכר לפעולות בעלי המסורת שהם כשומרי הומות העיר כי בעבורם עמדה תורת יהוה וספרי הקדש על מתכונתם בלי תוספת ומגרעת, i.e. Certe enim est merces operibus autorum Masoreth, qui sunt ut custodes murorum civitatis: propter eos enim permanet lex Domini et libri sancti in sua forma absque ulla additione vel detractione. Ab. Ezr. in l. יסוד מורא. [c. 1. init.]

and therefore all traditions of men which are contrary to this word of God are necessarily to be abhorred, and all traditions of men not recorded in this word of God are not necessarily to be believed. What is here written we are bound to believe because it is written; and what is not here written we are not bound to believe because it is not written. I say we are not bound to believe it, but I cannot say we are bound not to believe it; for there be many truths which we may believe, nay, are bound to believe, because truth, which notwithstanding are not recorded in the word of God. But though there be many things we may believe, yet is there nothing we need believe in order to our everlasting happiness which is not here written; so that if we believe all that is here spoken, and do all that is here commanded, we shall certainly be saved, though we do not believe what is not here spoken, nor do what is not here commanded.

And indeed the scripture itself is its own witness in this case: which if it was not, all the arguments in the world could never make this article to be a truth; for that the *scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation* is a truth, the belief of which is itself necessary to salvation; and therefore should the scripture contain all other necessary truths, and not contain this one necessary truth, even that it doth contain all necessary truths, it would not contain all things necessary to salvation. But what truth more frequently inculcated and more expressly contained in scripture than this? What words can express any thing more fully than those of St. Paul doth this, when he saith, *All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for* [d] *doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works*, 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17? Here we see the scriptures are sufficient to make a man, yea a man of God, a minister, 1 Tim. vi. 11, one whose duty it is to declare all the counsel of God, Acts xx. 27; yet the scriptures are sufficient to make such a man perfect, furnishing him with whatsoever he need acquaint his people with, or his people need to be confirmed in. And in the foregoing verse he tells Timothy, *the scriptures are able to make him wise to salvation*, 2 Tim. iii. 15. But how can that be, unless they contain all things necessary to salvation? What is it to be wise unto salvation, but to know whatsoever is necessary to be known in order to salvation? If the scriptures do not therefore contain all things necessary to be known, how can they make us wise unto salvation?

---

[d] Πρὸς διδασκαλίαν· εἴτι μαθεῖν εἴτι ἀγνοῆσαι χρὴ, ἐκεῖθεν εἰσόμεθα· εἰ ἐλέγξαι τὰ ψευδῆ καὶ τοῦτο ἐκεῖθεν· εἰ ἐπανορθωθῆναι, καὶ σωφρονισθῆναι· πρὸς παράκλησιν, πρὸς παραμυθίαν, φησὶ, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν· τοῦτ᾽ ἐστιν εἴ τι λείπει καὶ χρὴ προστεθῆναι· ἵνα ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος. Chrys. in 2 Tim. hom. 9. [vol. IV. p. 370. 26.] The Ethiopic translation for *πρὸς διδασκαλίαν* hath በኵሉ፡ ትምህርት፡ bacuil tymyhrt, *in all doctrine*, it is not only profitable for some doctrine, but for all that is necessary to be known.

To this purpose also make those places that forbid any addition to or detraction from the word of God; as, *You shall not add unto the word that I command you, neither shall you diminish aught from it*, Deut. iv. 2; and, *Whatsoever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it*, Deut. xii. 32. And that this may not be thought to have reference to the Pentateuch or Old Testament only, we have it again repeated in the New, with a curse annexed to it: *For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book*, Rev. xxii. 18, 19. *In this book*, that is, this book of the Revelations in particular, or the [e] whole book of the holy scriptures in general, of which this is the last book, and these almost the last words. Now in these and the like places it being so expressly forbidden to add any thing to or to take any thing from the holy scriptures, it follows that the holy scriptures do in themselves contain all things necessary to salvation. For otherwise, if there should be any thing necessary to salvation, and yet not contained in the scriptures, certainly it can be no sin, but rather a duty to add it to the scriptures, or to the articles of faith delivered in the scriptures, this being the end and scope of the scriptures, to shew us all things that belong to our eternal salvation. And so if there be any article of faith which God requires assent to from us, that himself hath not revealed in the holy scriptures to us, that article of faith must either be added to the holy scriptures, or we can never be saved; yes, to look after salvation God hath commanded us, but to add any thing to the scriptures he hath forbidden us; and therefore all things requisite to salvation must needs be contained in the scriptures, to which we need to add nothing as an article of faith in order to our salvation.

---

[e] Johannes apostolus sub unius libri appellatione de tota utriusque testamenti serie contestatus est, dicens, *Si quis*, inquit, *apposuerit ad hæc, apponet Deus omnes plagas scriptas in libro hoc.* Paulinus in concilio Forojuliens. [vol. IV. p. 854.] *Διαμαρτύρεται ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσι μήτε προσθεῖναί τι μήτ᾽ ἀφελεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὰ γραφικὰ ἰδιώματα, τῶν Ἀττικῶν συντάξεων, καὶ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν συλλογισμῶν ἡγεῖσθαι ἀξιοπιστότερα, καὶ σεμνότερα.* Andreas Cæsar. in loc. [p. 112.] Docet igitur nos præsentis series lectionis, neque detrahere aliquid divinis debere mandatis, neque addere. Nam si Johannes hoc judicavit de suis scriptis, *Si quis apposuerit*, inquit, *ad hæc, adjiciet in illum plagas quæ scriptæ sunt in libro isto, et qui dempserit de verbis his prophetiæ hujus, delebit Deus partem illius de libro vitæ;* quanto nihil divinis mandatis est detrahendum? Ambros. de parad. c. 12. [56. vol. I.]

And hence it is that the apostle saith, *But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed*, Gal. i. 8; that is, as the [f] Fathers interpret it, Whosoever it is that preacheth any thing as gospel which is not written in the gospel, or would thrust any thing upon you as an article of faith which is not revealed as so in the holy scriptures, let him be accursed. Whatsoever articles of faith St. Paul delivered to others by preaching, he hath delivered unto us in writing; and as the Galatians were not to receive any thing as an article of faith but what St. Paul had preached to them, so are we to receive nothing as an article of faith but what is written for us; and therefore whosoever preacheth or believeth any thing to be necessary to salvation which is not written in the holy scriptures, instead of getting salvation by it, he will find the curse here denounced to be entailed upon it.

---

[f] Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus ecclesia, sive de quacunque alia re quæ pertinet ad fidem, vitamque nostram, non dicam nos nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit, Licet nos, sed omnino quod secutus adjecit, *Si angelus de cælo vobis annunciaverit præterquam quod* in scripturis legalibus et evangelicis accepistis *anathema sit.* Aug. contra literas Petilian. l. 3. [7. vol. IX. p. 301.] Ὁ δὲ Παῦλος (ὅταν δὲ Παῦλον εἴπω τὸν Χριστὸν πάλιν λέγω, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἦν ὁ κινῶν αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν) καὶ ἀγγέλων ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβαινόντων αὐτὰς (γραφὰς) προστίθησι· καὶ μάλα εἰκότως· οἱ γὰρ ἄγγελοι κἂν μεγάλοι ἀλλὰ δοῦλοι καὶ λειτουργοὶ (γρ. ὑπουργοὶ) τυγ-

And lastly, to name no more, that we are to stick to the word of God, and not look among the traditions of men for the articles of our faith, or the behaviour of our life, Christ himself teacheth us in these words, *But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*, Matt. xv. 9. So that whatsoever worship we perform to God, unless it be of God's commanding, it will never be of God's accepting; it will be but a vain worship. Nay, it will be so far from God's accepting, that it will be of his rejecting; for it is so far from being a duty, that it is in plain terms a sin; for so saith our Saviour, *Why do you also transgress the commandments of God by your tradition?* ver. 3; and, *Thus have you made the commandments of God of none effect by your traditions*, ver. 6. So that to obtrude traditions of men for articles of faith, or to admit them for parts of divine worship necessary to salvation, is so far from having any countenance from the scriptures, that it is expressly forbidden in them. And therefore that it should be necessary to believe any thing merely upon tradition is itself a mere tradition.

And as this truth is grounded upon scripture, so is it agreeable to reason too. So that not only scripture itself saith that all things necessary to be known are contained in itself, but reason saith the same too. For if there be any thing not contained in scripture and yet necessary to be known, then there is something necessary to be known, which, notwithstanding, we can have no certainty of. What I see written I am certain of, because I see it written; but how can I be certain of any thing which is not written? Must I therefore believe it because others do? Or can I therefore be certain of it because others are? Then I must believe and be certain of whatsoever others believe or are certain of, and so that

---

χάνουσιν ὄντες· αἱ δὲ γραφαὶ πᾶσαι οὐ παρὰ δούλων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ τῶν ὅλων Θεοῦ δεσπότου γραφεῖσαι ἐπέμφθησαν. διὰ τοῦτό φησιν, ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίσηται παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν. Chrysost. in epist. ad Gal. hom. I. [vol. III. p. 718. 23.] *Καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν ἐὰν ἐναντία καταγγέλλωσιν, ἢ ἀνατρέπωσι τὸ πᾶν, ἀλλὰ κἂν μικρόν τι εὐαγγελίζωνται παρ' ὃ εὐαγγελισάμεθα, κἂν τὸ τυχὸν παρακινήσωσιν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστωσαν.* [Ibid.]

must be a necessary article of my faith which is an article of any man's faith; and so, unless I believe what every one believes, I can never be saved. But what reason have I to believe one man more than another? Are they not all men? No; the pope is more than a man, acted with an infallible spirit; and therefore in believing him I do not believe a mere man, but God himself speaking by him. But what ground can I have to believe this? Is it written in the scriptures that the pope is infallible? No, but that all men are liars. And so that the pope is infallible I have no certain ground to believe it, and therefore no certain ground to believe any thing he saith to be true.

But again, I would here ask any gainsayer, for what end were the scriptures written? Were they not therefore *written that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing we might have life through his name?* John xx. 31. Were they not written that we might *know the things that belong to our everlasting peace before they be hid from our eyes?* Were they not written that in them we might have *life eternal?* John v. 39. Yea, were they not written on purpose that we might have surer footing for our faith than mere tradition? But how can the scripture attain these ends, unless it be perfect and sufficient of itself to shew us our way to heaven, and to acquaint us with all necessary truths without the help of human traditions? If tradition would have served the turn still to ground our faith upon, as it was in the beginning of the world, certainly the scriptures were written in vain, and to no purpose. So that if it doth not contain all things, what need was there of its containing any thing that is necessary to salvation? For all the articles of our faith might as well have been delivered to us by tradition as some of them.

But such as say there is any thing that is neither contained in the scriptures, nor may be proved by them, which notwithstanding is requisite and necessary to salvation, let them tell me what these things are; or how came they first into the catalogue of the articles of the Christian faith. Is there any nation in the world that hath not some traditions peculiar to itself? Yea, and are there not many traditions that cross and contradict each other? Now which of all these am I bound to believe in order to my salvation? Or who shall be the judge betwixt traditions that dissent from one another? I speak not of such traditions (neither doth this article intend them) that concern only rites and ceremonies left to the disposition of the church, which, not being of divine but only positive and human right, may and do alter in every nation, and are acknowledged by none to be either necessary articles of our faith, or essential parts of God's worship; but of such traditions as are required of us as articles of faith, without which we can never be saved; for even these do often oppose and thwart each other, yea, and themselves too. There is scarce an age but makes some alteration in every one of the popish traditions, as about the infallibility of the pope, purgatory, and the like, there are new notions continually coining about them; all of which certainly cannot be necessary to salvation, because many of them are contrary to one another. Or which of them is or is not to be believed, how must it be determined but by the scriptures? Surely such as are contrary to the scriptures are therefore to be rejected, because contrary to the scriptures; such as agree with the scriptures are therefore to be believed, because they agree with the scriptures. And if there be any such that are neither contrary to the scriptures, nor can be proved by them, such certainly it is not necessary to reject or believe: it is not necessary we should reject them, because no way contrary to the scriptures; nor is it necessary to believe them as articles of our faith, because not contained in the scriptures. And so, though there be many things we may believe, yet there is nothing we must believe or not be saved, unless it be expressly asserted in the scriptures, or may be clearly deduced from them.

Neither is our church singular in this assertion, but we have all or most of the Fathers' hands for it. Let these few witness for the rest. First, Hippolytus[g] the martyr, who tells us "there is one God, whom we do not otherwise acknowledge (brethren) but out of the holy scriptures. For as he that would profess the wisdom of this world cannot otherwise attain to it than by reading the opinions of the philosophers; so whosoever of us would exercise piety towards God, we cannot otherwise learn it than out of the holy scriptures." And [h] Clemens Alexandrinus plainly; "Let us not simply attend to the words of men, which it is as lawful for us also to gainsay: but if it be not enough only to say what we think, but what is said ought to be believed, let us not look for testimony from men, but let us confirm what is questioned by the word of God, which is the certainest of all demonstrations, nay, is itself the only demonstration." And Tertullian[i]; "But whether all things were made of any subject matter, I never yet read. Let Hermogenes's shop show where it is written. If it be not written, let him fear that woe that is appointed to those that put any thing to or take any thing from the word of God."

---

[g] Unus Deus est quem non aliunde, fratres, agnoscimus quam ex sanctis scripturis. Quemadmodum enim si quis vellet sapientiam hujus seculi exercere, non aliter hoc consequi poterit, nisi dogmata philosophorum legat. Sic quicunque volumus pietatem in Deum exer-

Cyril of Hierusalem speaks much so to the purpose[k]: "For there ought nothing at all to be delivered concerning the divine and holy mysteries of faith without the holy scriptures, nor ought we to be moved at all with probabilities and prepared orations or compositions of speech. Neither do thou believe me that say these things, unless thou takest the demonstrations of the things which are said out of the holy scriptures." And Athanasius tells us[l], "The holy and divinely

---

cere, non aliunde discemus quam ex scripturis divinis. Hippol. hom. contra Noet. [Bibl. Max. patr. vol. III. p. 263.]

[h] *Οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῶς ἀποφαινομένοις ἀνθρώποις προσέχοιμεν, οἷς καὶ ἀνταποφαίνεσθαι ἐξ ἴσης ἔξεστιν· εἰ δ' οὐκ ἀρκεῖ μόνον ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν τὰ δόξαν ἀλλὰ πιστεύσασθαι δεῖ τὸ λεχθὲν, οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένωμεν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνῇ πιστούμεθα τὸ ζητούμενον, ἣ πασῶν ἀποδείξεων ἐχεγγυωτέρα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἡ μόνη ἀπόδειξις οὖσα τυγχάνει.* Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7. [p. 891.]

[i] An autem de aliqua subjacente materia facta sunt omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat væ illud adjicientibus et detrahentibus destinatum. Tertull. adv. Hermog. c. 22. [vol. II.]

[k] *Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων, μηδὲ τὸ τύχον ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν· μηδὲ ἁπλῶς πιθανότησι καὶ λόγων κατασκευαῖς παραφέρεσθαι· μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτα λέγοντι ἁπλῶς πιστεύσῃς, ἐὰν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν καταγγελλομένων ἀπὸ τῶν θείων μὴ λάβῃς γραφῶν.* Cyril. Hieros. Catech. 4. [12. p. 56.]

[l] *Αὐτάρκεις μὲν γὰρ εἰσὶν αἱ ἅγιαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν.* Athan. Orat. contra gentes. [init. vol. I.]

inspired scriptures are of themselves sufficient for the discovery of the truth." And St. Augustine[m], that "when our Lord Christ had done many things, all of them were not written, as the same holy evangelist testifies, that the Lord Christ had said and done many things that were not written; but those things were chosen out that they might be written, which seemed sufficient for the salvation of believers." And therefore [n]St. Basil saith, "That every word and action ought to be confirmed by the testimony of the divinely inspired scriptures, to the full confirmation of the good, and confusion of the evil." And that "it is an [o]evident falling from the faith, and an argument of pride, either to take away any thing from those things that are written, or to introduce any thing of those things which are not written." And Origen[p]; "But if there remaineth any thing which the holy scriptures doth not determine, no other third scripture ought to be received for the confirmation of knowledge."

And this is the touchstone that St. Cyprian examines traditions by: [q]"From whence," saith he, "is that tradition? Does it descend from divine and evangelical authority? or doth it come from the commands of the apostles, or their epistles? For that those things ought to be done which are written, God himself testifies and propounds, saying to Jesus Nave or Joshua, *Let not the book of this law depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate in it night and day, and thou shalt observe all the things that are written in them to do them.*

---

[m] Cum multa fecisset dominus Jesus non omnia scripta sunt, sicut idem ipse sanctus evangelista testatur: multa dominum Christum et dixisse et fecisse quæ scripta non sunt. Electa sunt autem quæ scriberentur quæ saluti credentium sufficere videbantur. Aug. in Joh. Tract. 49. [1. vol. III. par. ii.]

[n] *Ὅτι δεῖ πᾶν ῥῆμα καὶ πρᾶγμα πιστοῦσθαι τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς εἰς πληροφορίαν μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἐντροπὴν δὲ τῶν πονηρῶν.* Basil. [vol. II.] Moral. reg. 26.

[o] *Φανερὰ ἔκπτωσις πίστεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων, ἢ ἐπεισάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων.* Id. de fide. [vol. II. p. 386.]

[p] Si quid autem superfuerit quod non divina scriptura decernat, nullam aliam debere tertiam scripturam ad autoritatem scientiæ suscipi. Origen. in Lev. hom. 5. [9. vol. II.]

[q] Unde est ista traditio? Utrumne de dominica et evangelica autoritate descendens? an de apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda quæ scripta sunt Deus testatur et proponit, ad Jesum Nave dicens, *Non recedet liber legis hujus ex ore tuo, sed meditaberis in ea die et nocte, ut observes facere omnia quæ scripta sunt.* Item Dominus apostolos suos mittens, mandat *baptizari gentes et doceri ut observent omnia quæcunque ille præcepit.* Cypr. Epist. 74. [init.]

And the Lord also, sending the apostles, commands that all nations should be *baptized and taught, that they should observe whatsoever he commanded.*" And St. Cyril of Alexandria [r] too, saying, "That which the holy scripture hath not said, how can we receive it and put it into the catalogue of those things that be true?" This was also St. Hierome's opinion in the case [s]. "As we do not deny those things which are written, so we refuse those that are not written. That God was born of a Virgin, we believe it, because we read it; but that Mary was married after she was delivered we do not believe, because we do not read it." So careful were these Fathers to receive nothing as an article of faith but what is grounded upon the scriptures.

To these we may add Theophilus Alexandrinus, who tells us expressly, [t] "It is an instinct of the Devil to follow the sophisms of human minds, and to think any thing divine without the authority of the scriptures." And Cyril of the same place before mentioned: [u] "All things that are delivered to us by the Law, Prophets, and Apostles, we receive and know and acknowledge, looking for nothing more than these. For it is impossible we should speak, or so much as think any thing of God, besides those things which are divinely told us by the divine oracles both of the Old and New Testament." And to conclude, Constantine the Great, in his excellent oration to the council of Nice, he minds them how the [x] evangelical and apostolical books, and the divine oracles of the ancient prophets do clearly teach whatsoever we are to believe concerning God, and therefore in the conclusion saith, "[y] Let us take the solution of those things that are questioned out of the divinely inspired oracles or holy scriptures." Certainly accounting nothing as an article of faith but what may be proved from thence. And thus we, having scripture for our ground, reason for our guide, and the Fathers for our companions in it, we may well acknowledge and subscribe to it, *That the holy scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation*, &c.

---

[r] Ὃ γὰρ οὐκ εἴρηκεν ἡ θεία γραφὴ τίνα δὴ τρόπον παραδεξόμεθα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἔχουσι καταλογιούμεθα; Cyril. Alex. Glaphyr. in Gen. l. 2. [vol. I. p. 29.]

[s] Ut hæc quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta renuimus. Natum Deum esse de virgine credimus, quia legimus. Mariam nupsisse post partum non credimus, quia non legimus. Hieron. contra Helvid. [19. vol. II.]

[t] Dæmoniaci spiritus est instinctus sophismata humanarum mentium sequi, et aliquid extra scripturarum autoritatem putare divinum. Theoph. Alex. Pasch. 2. [Bibl. Max. patr. vol. V. p. 850.]

[u] Πάντα τὰ παραδεδομένα ἡμῖν διά τε νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων, δεχόμεθα, καὶ γινώσκομεν, καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν, οὐδὲν περαιτέρω τούτων ἐπιζητοῦντες. ἀδύνατον γὰρ παρὰ τὰ θειωδῶς ὑπὸ τῶν θείων λογίων τῆς τέ παλαιᾶς καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης ἡμῖν εἰρημένα εἰπεῖν τι περὶ Θεοῦ ἢ ὅλως ἐννοῆσαι. Cyril. de Trin. et pers. Christi. [vol. VI. init.]

[x] Εὐαγγελικαὶ γὰρ βίβλοι καὶ ἀποστολικαὶ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν προφητῶν τὰ θεσπίσματα σαφῶς ἡμᾶς ἅπερ χρὴ περὶ τοῦ θείου φρονεῖν ἐκπαιδεύουσι. Constant. Orat. ad syn. Nic. apud Theodoret. Hist. l. 1. c. [6. vol. III.]

Of the Names and Numbers of Canonical Books.

Genesis.
Exodus.
Leviticus.
Numbers.
Deuteronomy.
Joshua.
Judges.
Ruth.
The first Book of Samuel.
The second Book of Samuel.
The first Book of Kings.
The second Book of Kings.
The first Book of Chronicles.
The second Book of Chronicles.
The first Book of Esdras.
The second Book of Esdras.
The Book of Hester.
The Book of Job.
The Psalms.
The Proverbs.
Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher.
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon.
Four Prophets the greater.
Twelve Prophets the lesser.

And the other books (as Hierome saith) the church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine: such are these following:

The third Book of Esdras.
The fourth Book of Esdras.
The Book of Tobias.
The Book of Judeth.
The rest of the Books of Hester.
The Book of Wisdom.
Jesus the Son of Syrach.
Baruch the Prophet.
The Song of the Three Children.
The Story of Susanna.
Of Bell and the Dragon.
The Prayer of Manasses.
The first Book of Maccabees.
The second Book of Maccabees.

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive them, and account them canonical.

After Israel's return from Babylon, [z] Ezra, with other prophets and holy men, being met in the great council, (of which in the foregoing part of this article,) after they had gathered together the several books that were written by the inspiration of God, seeing the spirit of prophecy was now to cease, and so no more books after to be added to the canon of the scriptures; they determined the number of them, dividing them into three general parts, Moses, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa or Holy Writings, which division our Saviour himself doth afterwards take notice of, saying to his disciples, *That all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms*, Luke xxiv. 44, where *the Psalms*, being part of the holy writings, are put for them all. These three general parts were afterwards subdivided into several books. The Law of Moses into five books: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. The Prophets[b], as we find in the Talmud, were divided into

---

[y] Ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων λάβωμεν τῶν ζητουμένων τὴν λύσιν. Ibid.

[z] That it was Ezra or Esdras that gathered together the books of the

---

Old Testament after the captivity had scattered them abroad, the Fathers frequently inculcate: Quemadmodum et Hierosolymis Babylonica expugnatione deletis omne instrumentum Judaicæ literaturæ per Esdram constat restauratum. Tertul. de habit. mul. [vol. III. c. iii.] Et post deinde temporibus Artaxerxis Persarum regis, inspiravit Hesdræ sacerdoti tribus Levi, prophetarum omnes rememorare sermones et restituere populo eam legem quæ data esset per Moysem. Iren. adv. hæres. l. 3. c. [21. 2.] Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα προφήτας ἔπεμψε μυρία παθόντας δεινά. ἐπῆλθε πόλεμος, ἀνεῖλον πάντας, κατέκοψαν, ἐνεπρήσθησαν αἱ βίβλοι. ἑτέρῳ πάλιν ἀνδρὶ θαυμαστῷ ἐνέπνευσεν, ὥστε αὐτὰς ἐκθέσθαι, τῷ Ἔσδρᾳ λέγω, καὶ ἀπὸ λειψάνων συντεθῆναι ἐποίησε. Chrysost. in epist. ad Heb. hom. 8. [vol. IV. p. 478. 26.] Quo tempore Esdras Dei sacerdos combustam a Chaldæis in archivis templi restituit legem; nempe qui eodem spiritu qui in scriptura fuerat plenus fuit. Aug. [vol. III. par. ii. App.] de mirabil. S. Script. l. 2. c. 33.

[a] So Elias Levita, "כי לא היו הכד״ ספרים מחוברים יחד והם חברום ועשו מהם ג״ חלקים תורה נביאים וכתובים, i. e. For all the four and twenty books were not bound together, but they (viz. Ezra and the men of the great synagogue) bound them together, and made of them three parts, the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. Elias Levita, Præf. ad l. Masoreth. [p. יט]. This division is frequently to be met withal also in the Talmud, as הביאו לפנינו תירה נביאים וכתובים מדובקים כאחד: i. e. They brought before us the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, bound up together. Bava Bathra. [c. 1.] f. 13. 2. And in the Targum too, ועסיק בעשרין וארבעה ספרין דאוריתא ופתגמי נבואה וכתיבי, i. e. And he exercised himself in the twenty-four books of the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. Cant. V. 10. edit. Ven. [1547.]

[b] For thus we find in Bava Bathra, תנו רבנן סדרן של נביאים יהושע ושופטים שמואל ומלכים ירמיה ויחזקאל ישעיה ושנים עשר, i. e. our Rabbins have taught us that the order of the Prophets is, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezechiel, Isaiah, and the twelve lesser Prophets. But סדרן של כתובים רות ספר תהלים איוב משלי קהלת שיר השירים איכה דניאל מגילת אסתר עזרא דברי הימים, i. e. The orders of the Hagiographa,

eight parts: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezechiel, Isaiah, and the twelve lesser Prophets, which all made up but one part. The Holy Writings they divided into eleven parts: Ruth, the Book of Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations, Daniel, Hester, Ezra, and Chronicles. And so in all they reckoned four and twenty books. But afterwards Ruth being added to Judges and the Lamentations of Jeremiah to the Prophecy of Jeremiah their writer, the number was brought back to two and twenty[c], the exact number of the Hebrew letters, and thus reckoned: 1. Genesis. 2. Exodus. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. 5. Deuteronomy. 6. Joshua. 7. Judges and Ruth. 8. The first and second Books of Samuel. 9. The first and second Books of Kings. 10. The first and second Books of Chronicles. 11. The first and second Books of Esdras. 12. The Book of Hester. 13. The Book of Job. 14. The Psalms. 15. Proverbs. 16. Ecclesiastes. 17. The Song of Solomon. 18. Isaiah. 19. Jeremiah and Lamentations. 20. Ezechiel. 21. Daniel. 22. The twelve lesser Prophets.

Ruth, the Book of Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, the Book of Esther, Ezra, Chronicles. Bava Bathra, c. 1. f. 14. [2.]

[c] That the twenty-four were reduced to twenty-two appears from Josephus: *οὐ μυριάδες βιβλίων εἰσὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀσυμφώνων καὶ μαχομένων, δύο δὲ μόνα πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι βιβλία τοῦ παντὸς ἔχοντα χρόνου τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, τὰ δικαίως πεπιστευμένα.* Joseph. contra Apion. l. 1. [8.] And Origen cited by Eusebius, *οὐκ ἀγνοητέον δ' εἶναι τὰς ἐνδιαθήκους βίβλους, ὡς Ἑβραῖοι παραδιδόασιν, δύο καὶ εἴκοσιν ὅσος ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς στοιχείων ἐστίν.* Euseb. Hist. eccl. l. 6. c. 25. And that they numbered these two and twenty by putting Ruth to Judges, and Lamentations to Jeremiah, appeareth from the said Origen, who, giving both the Greek and Hebrew names of all the two and twenty, saith of Judges and Ruth, *Κριταὶ Ῥοὺθ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν ἑνὶ Σωφετίμ*: and concerning the Lamentations he saith, *Ἱερεμίας σὺν Θρήνοις καὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἑνὶ Ἱερεμίᾳ*, Ibid. As also from St. Hilary, who giveth us the number and order of the twenty-two books thus: Et ea causa est ut in viginti duos libros lex Testamenti Veteris deputetur, ut cum literarum numero conveniret. Qui ita secundum traditiones veterum deputantur, ut Mosi sint libri quinque Jesu Nave sextus, Judicum et Ruth septimus, primus et secundus Regnorum in octavum, tertius et quartus in nonum, Paralipomenon duo in decimum sint, Sermones dierum Esdræ in undecimum, liber Psalmorum in duodecimum, Salomonis proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Canticum canticorum in tertium decimum, quartum decimum et quintum decimum, duodecim autem prophetæ in sextum decimum, Esaias deinde, et Hieremias cum Lamentatione et Epistola (al. cum Lamentationibus) sed et Daniel, et Ezechiel, et Job, et Hester, viginti et duum librorum numerum consumment. Hilar. in Prol. in Psalm. [15.] Concil. Laod. c. 60.

Now, besides these here mentioned, there are other writings which pretend to the same authority, and are received by some into the canon of the scriptures as well as they. Such are, 1. The third and fourth Books of Esdras. 2. The Book of Tobias. 3. The Book of Judith. 4. The rest of the Book of Hester, viz. whatsoever is added to the ten chapters of Hester commonly received both by Jews and Christians, as a continuation of the history therein contained. 5. The Book of Wisdom, ascribed indeed to Solomon by some, but by others to Philo[d] the Jew, that lived in the apostles' times. 6. The Book of Jesus the Son of Syrach, or Ecclesiasticus. 7. Baruch the Prophet. 8. The four additions to the Prophecy of Daniel: 1. The Song of the Three Children; 2. The Story of Susanna; 3. Of Bell and the Dragon; 4. The Prayer of Manasseh or Azarias. Lastly, The first and second Books of Maccabees. Now these books, though they do contain many excellent things in them, and therefore may be read for the instruction of people in their duty, and the stirring of them to piety by the examples of persons and histories therein recorded, yet they are not of the same authority with the others before mentioned, and so no certain and sure foundation to ground any truth upon. So that whatsoever doctrine hath no more Divine authority to establish it than what it picks out of any of these books, is not looked upon as a scripture or Divine truth. And though we be bound to believe whatsoever the scripture saith, whether we be able to comprehend it by reason or no, yet towards the belief of any thing that is revealed in any of these books we are not bound to go any further, or rather we are bound to go no further, than reason guides us.

---

[d] Tempore Apostolorum surrexit quidam sapientissimus Athenis nutritus, et in lingua Græca et Chaldaica peritissimus vocatus Philon, qui multa dicta alia Salomonis reperit, per diversa loca dispersa, et in lingua Græca scripta, prout diversi sapientes audierant a Salomone, et in suis bibliothecis reposuerant: quæ quidem dicta ipse Philo sub uno volumine omnia redegit et congregavit, et redolenti eloquentia Græca conscripsit, quem librum Sapientiam Salomonis appellavit. Jacob [Parez] de Valentia in præf. ad Cant. [fol. 389.] Licet Philo disertissimus Judæorum hunc librum Græce scripserit ut communiter dicunt doctores et historiographi, tamen ipsum compilavit ex sententiis Salomonis. Lyr. in Sap. [vol. III.] c. 1. Quia et ipse stylus Græcam eloquentiam redolet, et nonnulli scriptorum veterum hunc esse Judæi Philonis affirmant. Hieron. in lib. Salom. [vol. IX. p. 1293.] Of this book Rupertus saith, Hæc scriptura neque de canone est. Rupert. in Gen. l. 3. c. [31.]

But though these books last mentioned be not of the same authority with the other, yet there be some that be, viz. certain books written since the Son of God's becoming man; and they are, I. The history of the Doctrine, Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Son of God made flesh, written by four several persons, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. II. The history of the Acts of the Apostles written by St. Luke. III. Several Epistles written; (1.) by St. Paul 14; viz. these following, 1. To the Romans, one. 2. To the Corinthians, two. 3. To the Galatians, one. 4. To the Ephesians, one. 5. To the Philippians, one. 6. To the Colossians, one. 7. To the Thessalonians, two. 8. To Timothy, two. 9. To Titus, one. 10. To Philemon, one. 11. To the Hebrews, one. (2.) By St. James, one. (3.) By St. Peter, two. (4.) By St. John, three. (5.) By St. Jude, one. All which Epistles are called General or Catholic Epistles, because not written to particular churches or persons, as St. Paul's are, but to the catholic church, or to the professors of Christianity in general. IV. The Revelations of St. John. And all these being written by the same Spirit that the Books of the Old Testament before named were, we account them to have the same authority that they have. And though some would obtrude upon us Hermes his Pastor, and Clemens's Epistle to the Corinthians, as part of the New Testament, as they do the other before mentioned as part of the Old; yet what we said of them we say of these, that though they have good instructions in them, and so may be read, yet they have not the stamp of Divine authority upon them, and therefore may not be received as parts of the holy scriptures. Neither indeed have these additions to the New so many abettors as the apocryphal additions to the Old have. Neither are they mentioned in these Articles, and therefore I need take no notice of them. But the great and only question here is about the number of the books of the Old Testament, viz. whether the apocryphal, as the first and second Books of Esdras, the Book of Tobias, and the rest, be of the same authority with those two and twenty which Ezra gathered together as canonical scripture. And it is here determined in the negative, that they are not; that though they may be read for the instruction of the people, yet they cannot be applied for the confirmation of any doctrine; which appears both from scripture, reason, and Fathers.

First, from the scripture, even from such places wherein the most high God is pleased to acquaint us with what kind of persons he made use of as his amanuenses or scribes to write down his will and pleasure, even such as himself calls *prophets*. It was by the *prophets that God at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past to the Fathers*, Heb. i. 1. *Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation, for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man*, 2 Pet. i. 20, 21; and the apostle Paul tells the Ephesians, *they are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets*, Ephes. ii. 20; all intimating to us (what the[e] Jews themselves acknowledge) that all that wrote in old time were prophets, even endowed with a prophetical spirit, and so their writings prophecies. But now it is certain, and granted on all hands, that [f] Malachi was the last of the prophets, and that after his time the spirit of prophecy ceased among the Jews, and so that no book or books that were written after that time were written by a prophetical spirit, nor therefore can be of Divine authority. And it is as certain that these Apocryphal books were written all after that time. For if they had been written before, and that by the spirit of prophecy, certainly Ezra would have received them with the other into the canon of the scriptures, which it is plain, from what hath been shewn, that he did not. And again, who knoweth not that the History of the Maccabees was long after that time, unless the history of them would have been made before themselves: which if it had, it would have been a prophecy, not a history, as really as it is now a history, and not a prophecy. And so for the other books, besides that there is something almost in every one of them which betrays their novelty in respect of the antiquity of the ancient prophets: for if they had been written when the other prophets wrote, they would have been written in the same language that the other prophets wrote in, especially they would never have written in Greek, (as it is plain they did,) when the Greek language then was, like the people, accounted profane, and the Hebrew language themselves used, of all the languages in the world, was only accounted holy, and therefore only fit to write such holy things in.

---

[e] *Ἅτε μήτε τοῦ ὑπογράφειν αὐτεξουσίου πᾶσιν ὄντος, μήτε τινὸς ἐν τοῖς γραφομένοις ἐνούσης διαφωνίας· ἀλλὰ μόνων τῶν προφητῶν τὰ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ παλαιότατα κατὰ τὴν ἐπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ μαθόντων, τὰ δὲ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ὡς ἐγένετο σαφῶς συγγραφόντων.* Joseph. contra Apion. lib. I. [7.]

[f] Moses legislator primus divina responsa nobis perscripta reliquit. Divus vero Malachias post omnes qui prophetiam scripserunt divina oracula scriptis mandavit. Theodor. in Malach. [vol. II.] Indeed the Talmudists themselves acknowledge this, that the spirit of prophecy was not in the second temple as it had been in the first, and by consequence not after Malachi. For speaking of the defect of ה at the end of אכבד, Hag. i. 8. they say it was החסרו אלו חמשה דברים שהיו בין מקדש ראשון למקדש שני ואילו הן ארון וכפורת וכרובים אש ושכינה ורוח הקדש ואורים ותומים: i. e. because there were five things that were in the first sanctuary or temple wanting in the second temple, and they were the ark with the mercy-seat and cherubims, the heavenly fire, the divine presence, and the Holy Spirit, and the Urim and Thummim. [Talm. Bab. vol. III.] Joma c. I. [ad fin.]. Where by the Holy Spirit was certainly meant the spirit of prophecy; and therefore Aruch reckons up the five things thus, ארון וכפורת וכרוב אחד שכינה שני רוח הקדש שהוא נבואה שלישי ואורים ותומים רביעי אש מן השמים חמישי: i. e. the ark with the mercy-seat and cherubims one; the Divine presence the second; the spirit of holiness, which is the spirit of prophecy, the third; the Urim and Thummim the fourth; the fire from heaven the fifth. Aruch, in כבד. But were not Malachi, Haggai, and Zachariah all prophets in the second temple? To this R. Bechai answers, that the Divine presence and prophecy was indeed there אלא שלא שרתה בו תדיר כמו בבית

And if from scripture we pass to reason, one might think this is reason enough to reject the Divine authority of these books, because not delivered to us in the same language that the other are. As it was the Hebrew language that discovered God's people from all other people, so certainly it is the Hebrew language that may discover God's scripture from all other scriptures. But again, if these Apocryphal writings be any part of the word of God, they are either part of the Old or New Testament; one of them they must needs be, because these two Testaments contain the whole word of God. But

---

ראשון: i. e. but it was not there always as it was in the first house. R. Bechai in Pentat. [fol. נט.] implying that though it was there a while so long as those prophets lived, yet after that it ceased. Hence it is that Josephus himself saith, *ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀρταξέρξου μέχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνου γέγραπται μὲν ἕκαστα· πίστεως δ' οὐχ ὁμοίας ἠξίωται τοῖς πρὸ ἑαυτῶν διὰ τὸ μὴ γένεσθαι τὴν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχήν.* Joseph. contra Apion. Lib. I. [8.]

first, they are no part of the New Testament, for then they would discover something of the birth, or life, or death, or doctrine of Christ the Son of God, which it is plain they do not. Neither, secondly, are they any part of the Old Testament, for then the Jews would have used them before our Saviour's coming, as well as any Christians have done since: [g] but I dare challenge any one whatsoever to shew me any one place in either of the Talmuds, in any of the Targums, or indeed in any of the Jewish writers, where they make mention of any of these books. If they had been any part of the Old Testament, why was there not also a masora made upon them as well as upon the other books? How came it to pass that they were left out and others taken into the number of canonical books by Ezra? Was not he a prophet? Did not he write canonical books himself? And how then should not he be able to discern betwixt canonical and apocryphal books? Neither were the Jews only unacquainted with the books so long ago, but to this day ask any of them, and they will tell you there is nothing scripture, nothing the word of God, nothing of Divine authority, but what is ordinarily read in their synagogues, which I am sure these books never yet were.

But because the judgment of the primitive church may be of the greatest weight in this case, I shall endeavour, in the next place, to discover, that our church doth here, as in all other things, tread exactly in the steps of the ancient Fathers. And in shewing the judgment of the primitive church, I might first produce the canons of the apostles (so called) themselves, which, though it be no convincing argument in itself, yet it is to the adversaries unto this truth, who do so confidently affirm the apostles themselves to be the authors of them. For these very canons do number the books of the Old Testament after the same manner that we do, differing in nothing but the three Books of the Maccabees, and leaving out Ezra. But for all the other books which some would now bring in as canonical, they left out as apocryphal. But throwing these into[h] the margent, let us inquire into the primitive church; and if we here cast our eyes upon Eusebius, in him we shall find Melito writing to Onesimus, who had often desired him to acquaint him with the number and order of the books of the Old Testament, and satisfying his desire after this manner[i]: "Going therefore," saith he, "into the East, and being in the place where these things were preached and done, and diligently learning the books of the Old Testament, I have here sent them underwritten to you; the names whereof are these: the five books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus,

---

[g] That the Jews received not any of these books into the canon of the scripture I have before shewed, in discovering the number of canonical books which they reckoned upon to be but twenty-two, or at most twenty-four. There we may see the Talmud, Josephus, and some Fathers' testimonies for it, to which we may add these: Quomodo igitur viginti duo elementa sunt per quæ scribimus Hebraice omne quod loquimur, et eorum initiis vox humana comprehenditur, ita viginti duo volumina supputantur quibus quasi literis et exordiis in Dei literis tenera adhuc et lactens viri justi erudiatur infantia. Hieron. in Prol. [Sam. vol. IX. p. 455.] Hebræi vetus Testamentum Esdra autore juxta numerum literarum suarum viginti duobus libris accipiunt, dividentes eos in tres ordines, Legis videlicet et Prophetarum et Hagiographorum. Isidor. Orig. l. 6. c. 1.

---

[h] *Ἔστω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν κληρικοῖς καὶ λαϊκοῖς βιβλία σεβάσμια καὶ ἅγια, τὰ μὲν παλαιᾶς διαθήκης Μώσεως πέντε, Γένεσις, Ἔξοδος, Λευϊτικὸν, Ἀριθμοὶ, Δευτερονόμιον· Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Ναυῆ ἕν· Κριτῶν ἕν· Ῥοὺθ ἕν· Βασιλειῶν τέσσαρα· Παραλειπομένων τῆς βίβλου τῶν ἡμερῶν δύο· Ἐστὴρ ἕν· Μακαβαϊκῶν τρία· Ἰὼβ ἕν· Ψαλτήριον ἕν· Σολομῶντος τρία, Παροιμίαι, Ἐκκλησιαστὴς, Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων· Προφητῶν δεκαδύο· ἓν Ἡσαίου· Ἱερεμίου ἕν· Ἰεζεκιὴλ ἕν· Δανιὴλ ἕν.* Canon. Apost. [85. p. 56. vol. I. Synodic. Beveregii.]

[i] *Ἀνελθὼν οὖν εἰς τὴν ἀνατολὴν καὶ ἕως τοῦ τόπου γενόμενος ἔνθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη καὶ ἀκριβῶς μαθὼν τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία ὑποτάξας ἔπεμψά σοι· ὧν ἐστι τὰ ὀνόματα· Μωσέως πέντε, Γένεσις, Ἔξοδος, Λευϊτικὸν, Ἀριθμοὶ, Δευτερονόμιόν· Ἰησοῦς Ναυῆ, Κριταὶ, Ῥούθ· Βασιλειῶν τέσσαρα, Παραλειπομένων δύο, Ψαλμῶν Δαβὶδ, Σολομῶνος Παροιμίαι, ἡ Σοφία, Ἐκκλησιαστὴς, Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων, Ἰὼβ, προφητῶν, Ἡσάϊου, Ἱερεμίου, τῶν δώδεκα ἐν μονοβίβλῳ, Δανιὴλ, Ἰεζεκιὴλ, Ἔσδρας.* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 4. c. 26. Lat. 25. Nothing can be objected against this catalogue, but that after *Σολομῶνος παροιμίαι* he adds *ἡ σοφία*, which some would persuade us denotes the Book of Wisdom, commonly called Apocryphal. But Ruffinus gives us another exposition of the words, translating them *Salomonis Proverbia, quæ et Sapientia*, and so making *Wisdom* here to be but the same with *Proverbs*, two names of one thing; and truly it seems; for *ἡ σοφία* in some copies is read *ἡ καὶ σοφία*; and therefore is it that in the margent to mine *ἡ καὶ σοφία* is put in as another reading; and therefore also in Nicephorus are the same words translated *Salomonis Proverbia sive Sapientia*, so that he plainly read it *Σολομῶνος παροιμίαι ἢ σοφία*. And truly it was an easy mistake afterwards to write *ἡ* for *ἤ*, and thus we find the Proverbs often called the Wisdom of Solomon: *Οὐ μόνος δὲ οὗτος* (saith Eusebius,) *ἀλλὰ καὶ Εἰρηναῖος καὶ πᾶς ὁ τῶν ἀρχαίων χορὸς πανάρετον σοφίαν τὰς Σολομῶνος παροιμίας ἐκάλουν.* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 22. Gr. 21. Lat. Thus doth Gregory Nazianzen call it *ὁ μὲν δὲ θεῖος Σολομῶν ἐν τῇ παιδαγωγικῇ σοφίᾳ, ταῖς παροιμίαις λέγω*, in laud. Gorg. sororis. [vol. I. p. 180.]

Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Jesus Nave, Judges, Ruth, four books of the Kings, two of the Chronicles, the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon or Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Job, the Prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the twelve lesser Prophets contained in one book, Daniel, Ezechiel, Ezra." Which enumeration of books we exactly in this article follow, only separating Lamentations from Jeremiah, and Esther from Ezra, which he here joins together.

And thus doth Gregory Nazianzen give us also the catalogue of the canonical books. First, saith he[k], "The historical books are, first, Genesis, then Exodus and Leviticus, then Numbers, then Deuteronomy, then Joshua and Judges, Ruth is the eighth, the ninth and the tenth books are the Acts of the Kings and the Chronicles, and in the last place thou hast Esdras or Ezra. The poetical books are five; whereof the first is Job, then David, then the three books of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, the Canticles and Proverbs. And the books written by a prophetical spirit are also five. The twelve lesser Prophets make one book; Hosea, and Amos, and Micah, the third; then Joel, then Jonas, and Abdiah, and Nahum, and Habakuk, and Sophoniah, and Haggai; and then Zachariah and Malachi, and these are one book. The second is Isaiah, then Jeremiah, then Ezechiel, and Daniel." And these are the only books he saith that are canonical, all the rest apocryphal.

And Epiphanius neither takes one more in, nor leaves one more out of the canon than we do[1]. "Thus," saith he, "are the

---

[k] Ἱστορικαὶ μὲν ἐάσι βίβλοι δυοκαίδεκα πᾶσαι
Τῆς ἀρχαιοτέρης Ἑβραϊκῆς σοφίας.
Πρώτη Γένεσις, εἶτ᾽ Ἔξοδος, Λευϊτικὸν,
Ἔπειτ᾽ Ἀριθμοὶ, εἶτα Δεύτερος Νόμος.
Ἔπειτ᾽ Ἰησοῦς καὶ Κριταὶ, Ῥοὺθ ὀγδόη.
Ἡ δὲ ἐνάτη δεκάτη τε βίβλοι πράξεις Βασιλήων,
Καὶ Παραλειπόμεναι, ἔσχατον Ἔσδραν ἔχεις.
Αἱ δὲ στιχηραὶ πέντε, ὧν πρῶτος Ἰώβ.
Ἔπειτα Δαβὶδ, εἶτα τρεῖς Σολομόντειαι,
Ἐκκλησιαστὴς, Ἆισμα, καὶ Παροιμίαι.
Καὶ πένθ᾽ ὁμοίως πνεύματος προφητικοῦ.
Μίαν μὲν εἰσὶν εἰς γραφὴν οἱ δώδεκα,
Ὡσηὲ, κ᾽Ἀμὼς, καὶ Μιχαίας ὁ τρίτος.
Ἔπειτ᾽ Ἰωὴλ, εἶτ᾽ Ἰωνᾶς, Ἀβδίας,
Ναούμ τε, Ἀμβακούμ τε· καὶ Σοφονίας,
Ἀγγαῖος, εἶτα Ζαχαρίας, καὶ Μαλαχίας,
Μία μὲν οἵδε· δεύτερα δὲ Ἡσαΐας
Ἔπειθ᾽ ὁ κληθεὶς Ἱερεμίας ἐκ βρέφους.
Ἔπειτ᾽ Ἰεζεκιὴλ, καὶ Δανιήλος χάρις.
Ἀρχαίας μὲν ἔθηκε δύω καὶ εἴκοσι βίβλους
Τοῖς τῶν Ἑβραίων γράμμασιν ἀντιθέτους.

Greg. Naz. p. 98. edit. Paris. Gr. Lat. [vol. II.]

[1] Οὕτως γ᾽ οὖν σύγκεινται αἱ βίβλοι ἐν πεντατεύχοις τέταρσι, καὶ μένουσιν ἄλλαι δύο ὑστεροῦσαι. ὡς εἶναι τὰς ἐνδιαθέτους βίβλους οὕτως, πέντε μὲν νομικὰς Γένεσιν, Ἔξοδον, Λευϊτικὸν, Ἀριθμοὺς, Δευτερονόμιον· αὕτη ἡ πεντάτευχος καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία. Πέντε γὰρ στιχήρεις, ἡ τοῦ Ἰὼβ βίβλος, εἶτα τὸ

(canonical) books contained in four Pentateuchs, other two remaining behind. So that the canonical books are thus: five legislative books, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; that is, the Pentateuch and the giving of the Law. And five poetical books; the Book of Job, then the Psalter, the Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs. Then another Pentateuch, which is called *the Writings*, and by some *the Holy Writings* or *Hagiographa;* which are thus: the Book of Joshua the son of Nun, of Judges with Ruth, the first of the Chronicles with the second, the first of the Kings with the second, and the third of the Kings with the fourth; that is the third Pentateuch. Another Pentateuch is, the twelve lesser Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezechiel, and Daniel; and that is the prophetical Pentateuch. But there remain two more; one is Ezra, which is also reckoned, and another book called Hester: and so the two and twenty books are completed." And this is the number of canonical books which Amphilochius also gives us[m], as we may see in the margent.

But these you will say were particular persons; but was there ever any council or synod before that of ours which ever determined the number of canonical books as ours did? Yes, the Laodicæan council itself, assembled in the third cen-

---

Ψαλτήριον, Παροιμίαι Σολομῶντος, Ἐκκλησιαστὴς, Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων· εἶτα ἄλλη πεντάτευχος τὰ καλούμενα γραφεῖα, παρά τισι δὲ ἁγιόγραφα λεγόμενα, ἅτινά ἐστιν οὕτως, Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῆ βίβλος, Κριτῶν μετὰ τῆς Ῥοὺθ, Παραλειπομένων πρώτη μετὰ τῆς δευτέρας, Βασιλειῶν πρώτη μετὰ τῆς δευτέρας, Βασιλειῶν τρίτη μετὰ τῆς τετάρτης. Αὕτη τρίτη μὲν πεντάτευχος. ἄλλη πεντάτευχος τὸ δωδεκαπρόφητον, Ἠσαΐας, Ἱερεμίας, Ἐζεκιὴλ, Δανιὴλ, καὶ αὕτη ἡ προφητικὴ πεντάτευχος. ἔμειναν δὲ ἄλλαι δύο, αἵτινές εἰσι τοῦ Ἔσδρα μία, καὶ αὕτη λογιζομένη, καὶ ἄλλη βίβλος ἡ τῆς Ἐστὴρ καλεῖται· ἐπληρώθησαν οὖν αἱ εἴκοσι δύο βίβλοι. Epiphan. de ponderibus et mensuris. [vol. II. p. 162.]

[m] Τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς πρῶτα διαθήκης ἐρῶ,
Ἡ πεντάτευχος, τὴν Κτίσιν, εἶτ' Ἔξοδον,
Λευϊτικὸν δὲ τὴν μέσην ἔχει βίβλον.
μεθ' ἣν Ἀριθμούς, εἶτα Δευτερονόμιον.
τούτοις Ἰησοῦν προστίθει, καὶ τοὺς Κριτὰς,
Ἔπειτα τὴν Ῥούθ, Βασιλειῶν τε τέσσαρας
βίβλους. Παραλειπομένων δέ γε ξυνωρίδα.
Ἔσδρας ἐπ' αὐταῖς πρῶτος, εἶθ' ὁ δεύτερος.
ἑξῆς στιχηρὰς πέντε σοι βίβλους ἐρῶ.
στεφθέντος ἄθλοις ποικίλων παθῶν Ἰώβ,
Ψαλμῶν τε βίβλον, ἔμμελες ψυχῶν ἄκος,
τρεῖς δ' αὖ Σολομῶντος τοῦ σοφοῦ, Παροιμίας,
Ἐκκλησιαστὴν, Ἆισμα δ' αὐτῶν ᾀσμάτων.
Ταύταις προφήτας προστίθει τοὺς δώδεκα
Ὡσηὲ πρῶτον, εἶτ' Ἀμῶς τὸν δεύτερον, κ. τ. λ.
Μεθ' οὓς προφήτας μάνθανε τοὺς τέσσαρας
Παρρησιαστὴν τὸν μέγαν Ἠσαΐαν,
Ἱερεμίαν τε, συμπαθῆ, καὶ μυστικὸν
Ἰεζεκιὴλ, ἔσχατον δὲ Δανιήλ,
τὸν αὐτὸν ἔργοις καὶ λόγοις σοφώτατον.
τούτοις προσεγκρίνουσι τὴν Ἐσθὴρ τινές.

Amphil. apud Greg. Naz. [vol. II. p. 194.] in Iamb. ad Seleucum: et apud Balsam. in can. p. 1083.

tury after our Saviour's time, and afterwards approved by the sixth Constantinopolitan synod, which also was confirmed by pope Adrian; and so the Laodicæan council, confirmed by him too, I say this Laodicæan council, gathered together from the several provinces of Asia, did then decree the number of canonical books in the third century, as our Convocation, collected out of the two provinces of England, determined them in the fifteenth century after our Saviour; taking in never a book that is here left out, nor leaving out any book that is here taken in of the Old Testament, nor indeed of the New, but only the Revelations. For this is the whole catalogue of books which they acknowledge to be canonical; saying[n], "But the books which ought to be read of the Old Testament are, 1. Genesis; 2. Exodus; 3. Leviticus; 4. Numbers; 5. Deuteronomy; 6. Joshua; 7. Judges and Ruth; 8. Esther; 9. The first and second of the Kings (which we call the first and second of Samuel); 10. The third and fourth of Kings, (which we call the first and second of Kings;) 11. The first and second of Chronicles; 12. The first and second of Ezra; 13. The Book of 150 Psalms; 14. The Proverbs of Solomon; 15. Ecclesiastes; 16. The Song of Songs; 17. Job; 18. The twelve lesser Prophets; 19. Isaiah; 20. Jeremiah and the Lamentations; 21. Ezechiel; 22. Daniel.

---

[n] *Ὅσα δεῖ βιβλία ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης, α′ Γένεσις κόσμου, β′ Ἔξοδος Αἰγύπτου, γ′ Λευϊτικὸν, δ′ Ἀριθμοὶ, ε′ Δευτερονόμιον, ς′ Ἰησοῦς Ναυῆ, ζ′ Κριταὶ, Ῥοὺθ, η′ Ἐσθὴρ, θ′ Βασιλειῶν α′ β′, ι′ Βασιλειῶν γ′ δ′, ια′ Παραλειπόμενα α′ β′, ιβ′ Ἔσδρας α′ β′, ιγ′ βίβλος Ψαλμῶν ρν′, ιδ′ Παροιμίαι Σολομοῦντος, ιε′ Ἐκκλησιαστὴς, ις′ Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων, ιζ′ Ἰὼβ, ιη′ δώδεκα Προφῆται, ιθ′ Ἡσαΐας, κ′ Ἱερεμίας καὶ Βαροὺχ, Θρῆνοι, καὶ Ἐπιστολαὶ, κα′ Ἰεζεκιὴλ, κβ′ Δανιήλ. τὰ δὲ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης ταῦτα, Εὐαγγελια τέσσαρα, κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην· Πράξεις ἀποστόλων, Ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαὶ ἕπτα, οὕτως, Ἰακώβου μία, Πέτρου δύο, Ἰωάννου τρεῖς, Ἰούδα μία· ἐπιστολαὶ Παύλου δεκατέσσαρες, πρὸς Ῥωμαίους μία, πρὸς Κορινθίους δύο, πρὸς Γαλάτας μία, πρὸς Ἐφεσίους μία, πρὸς Φιλιππίους μία, πρὸς Κολοσσάεις μία, πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς δύο, πρὸς Ἑβραίους μία, πρὸς Τιμόθεον δύο, πρὸς Τίτον μία, πρὸς Φιλήμονα μία.* Concil. Laodic. Canon. 60. [Synodic. Beveregii, vol. I. p. 481.] Where for *Ἱερεμίας καὶ Βαροὺχ, Θρῆνοι καὶ Ἐπιστολαὶ*, Mercator hath only Jeremias, they all signifying but one and the same thing, and therefore do they all make up but one, viz. the twentieth book, received by this ancient synod into the canon of the scriptures; and therefore is it also that I have translated them likewise but by two words, Jeremiah and Lamentations, adding Lamentations distinctly, because so used by us, though frequently accounted but part of Jeremiah by the Fathers.

But the Books of the New Testament are these: four Gospels; according to St. Matthew, according to St. Mark, according to St. Luke, and according to St. John: the Acts of the Apostles: the seven General Epistles; of St. James one, of St. Peter two, of St. John three, of St. Jude one. The Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle fourteen: to the Romans one, to the Corinthians two, to the Galatians one, to the Ephesians one, to the Philippians one, to the Colossians one, to the Thessalonians two, to Timothy two, to Titus one, to Philemon one, to the Hebrews one."

Thus we see how careful the Fathers are to bring the canonical books into the scriptures; and truly they are as careful to keep the apocryphal out. They acknowledge them indeed lawful to be read, as we do, but not of the same authority with the former. So Athanasius[o]: "But besides these, there are other books of the Old Testament not received into the canon of the scriptures, but only read to the catechumens, or such as are to be instructed in the Christian religion; as, the Wisdom of Solomon," and the rest, which he names in order. And Epiphanius[p] saith: "They are useful and profitable indeed, but are not brought into the number of canonical books." And St. Hierome[q] saith: "As therefore the church reads indeed Judith and Tobit and the books of the Maccabees, but doth not receive them amongst canonical scriptures; so these two books (viz. the Book of Wisdom and Jesus the son of Syrach) the church may read for the edification and instruction of the people, but not to confirm the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines." Which I suppose is the place intended in this Article, where St. Hierome is quoted. So Lyra[r]: "But whatsoever is without these, (I speak of the Old Testament,) as St. Hierome saith, is to be put among the Apocrypha; these are the books that are not in the canon, which notwithstanding the church admits as good and useful books, but not as canonical: amongst which are some of greater authority, others of less: for Tobias, Judith, and the books of the Maccabees, the Book of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, are much approved of by all." And presently, [s]"But Baruch, and the third and fourth book of Esdras, are of less authority." I shall conclude this with that excellent passage in Ruffinus, who, having numbered the canonical books both of the Old and New Testament every way as they are here determined, neither taking in one book that is here in this article left out, nor leaving out one book that is here taken in, he adds, [t]"These are they which the Fathers concluded within the canon, out of which they would have the assertions of our faith to consist. But we must know that there are other books which are not called *canonical* but *ecclesiastical* by the ancients, as the Wisdom of Solomon, and another Wisdom which is called the Wisdom of the son of Syrach, which book amongst the Latins is called by the general name Ecclesiasticus, by which word not the author of the book but the quality of the writing is surnamed. Of the same order is the Book of Tobit, and Judith, and the books of the Maccabees. But in the New Testament a little book called the Pastor or Hermas, which is named The Two Ways, or the Judgment according

---

[o] *'Εκτὸς δὲ τούτων εἰσὶ πάλιν ἕτερα βιβλία τῆς αὐτῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, ἀναγινωσκόμενα δὲ μόνον τοῖς κατηχουμένοις, ταῦτα· Σοφία Σολομῶνος οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ Πᾶσα σοφία παρὰ Κυρίου*, &c. Athanas. Synops. S. Scripturæ. init. [vol. II. p. 128.]

[p] *Καὶ αὐταὶ χρήσιμοι μὲν εἰσὶ καὶ ὠφέλιμοι, ἀλλ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν ῥητῶν οὐκ ἀναφέρονται.* Epiph. de ponder. et mensuris. [vol. II. p. 162.]

[q] Sicut ergo Judith et Tobiæ et Machabæorum libros legit quidem ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas scripturas non recipit: sic et hæc duo volumina legat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad autoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam. Hieron. Proleg. in libros Salomonis. [vol. IX. p. 1296.]

[r] Quicquid autem extra hos est (de veteri Testamento loquor) ut dicit Hieronymus inter Apocrypha est ponendum. Isti sunt libri qui

---

non sunt in canone, quos tamen ecclesia ut bonos et utiles libros admittit, non ut canonicos: inter quos sunt aliqui majoris autoritatis, alii minoris. Nam Tobias, et Judith, et Machabæorum libri, Sapientia quoque atque Ecclesiastes valde ab omnibus probantur. Lyran. proleg. primo post enum. can. [vol. I.]

[s] Minoris autem autoritatis sunt Baruch et tertius et quartus Esdræ. *Ibid.*

[t] Hæc sunt quæ Patres intra canonem concluserunt, ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt. Sciendum tamen est quod et alii libri sunt qui non canonici sed ecclesiastici a majoribus appellantur. Ut est Sapientia Salomonis, et alia Sapientia quæ dicitur filii Syrach, qui liber apud Latinos hoc ipso generali vocabulo Ecclesiasticus appellatur: quo vocabulo non autor libelli sed scripturæ qualitas cognominata est. Ejusdem ordinis est libellus Tobiæ, et Judith, et Machabæorum libri. In novo vero Testamento libellus qui dicitur Pastoris sive Hermatis, qui appellatur Duæ viæ, vel Judicium secundum Petrum: quæ omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad autoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Ruffin. Expos. [symb. ad calc. Cypriani, p. 26.]

to Peter. All which they would have read indeed in the churches, but not produced to confirm the authority of our faith out of them." And thus we see how clear and express the Fathers are, not only in determining the same number of canonical books that is in this article determined, but also in passing their judgment upon the apocryphal books as this article doth; even that though the church reads them *for example of life, and instruction of manners*, yet it doth not *apply them to establish any doctrine.*

ARTICLE VII.

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

THE several books of the holy scripture spoken of in the foregoing article, though written at several times, by several persons, in several places, and after several manners, yet do not deliver several, but one and the same doctrine; yea, the Old Testament, that was written so long before the New, doth not deliver any other doctrine than what the New doth, that was written so long after the Old; neither doth the New Testament deliver any other doctrine than what the Old doth, that was written so long before it; Christ being the sum and substance of both; Christ, in prophecy, the sum of the Law; Christ, in history, the sum of the Gospel. And truly the prophecies of the one and the histories of the other do so exactly agree, that the prophecies of the Old Testament seem to be nothing but the histories of the New foretold in prophecy; neither do the histories of the New Testament seem any thing else than the prophecies of the Old recorded in history: so that howsoever they may differ in circumstances, be sure they[a] agree in the substance.

---

[a] Καὶ ὡς μὲν πρὸς τὴν μάθησιν οὐδὲν διέστηκε τὰ εὐαγγέλια τοῦ νόμου· ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν καὶ ἀπόδοσιν διέστηκε· τί γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος; εὐαγγέλιον προκατηγγελμένον· τί δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; νόμος πεπληρωμένος. Quæst. et Resp. ad Orthodox. Justino ascript. Quæst. 101. Quid est enim quod dicitur Testamentum Vetus nisi occultatio Novi?

That there be some circumstances in which they differ, it cannot be denied; for the Old and New Testaments differ, first, in external symbols and sacraments. Though the grace sealed by the different sacraments be the same, yet the sacraments that seal that same grace are different; the sacraments of the Old Testament being Circumcision and the Paschal Lamb; the sacraments of the New, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Secondly, they differ in the external rites and ceremonies annexed to these sacraments: for the sacraments of the Old, in that they are Circumcision and the Paschal Lamb, and not Baptism and the Lord's Supper, must needs differ in ceremonies from the New: for if the substance differ, the ceremonies cannot be the same, though the ceremonies may differ, and yet the substance be the same. Thirdly, they differ in facility and difficulty of using. It is an easier thing to be baptized under the Gospel, than it was to be circumcised under the Law; and it was a harder thing to eat the Paschal Lamb under the Law, than it is to eat the Lord's Supper under the Gospel. Fourthly, They differ in the manner of signification. Though the thing signified was the same, yet the manner of its signification differed. The Old Testament signified Christ to come hereafter; the New signifies the same Christ, but as come already. The Law promises only what the Gospel relates, but the Gospel relates also what the Law promises. And so they under the Law saw the Sun of Righteousness drawing towards them, but they under the Gospel saw the Sun of Righteousness risen upon them. And therefore though the same light shone in the Old that shines in the New Testament, yet there it was but as the twilight, [b]here as the noonday. Fifthly, They differ also in the extent of their objects. [c]The Old Testament took in the Jews only, and not the Gentiles; the New

---

et quid est aliud quod dicitur Novum nisi Veteris revelatio. Aug. de civit. Dei, l. 16. c. 26. [2. vol. VII.]

[b] *Εἰ ἡ παλαιὰ, φῶς, τί ἡ καινὴ* (*διαθήκη*), *ἔνθα τοσαῦτα ἀνεπετάσθη; ἔνθα τοσοῦτόν ἐστι τὸ μέσον, ὅσον εἰ τοῖς οὐδὲν πλέον τῆς γῆς εἰδόσι τὸν οὐρανόν τις ἀνοίξειε, καὶ πάντα ποιήσοι κατοπτεῦσαι.* Chrys. in 2 Tim. hom. 8. [vol. IV. p. 368.]

[c] *Ὁ γὰρ ἐν Χωρὴβ παλαιὸς ἤδη νόμος καὶ ὑμῶν* (*Ἰουδαίων*) *μόνον, ὁ δὲ πάντων ἁπλῶς· νόμος δὲ κατὰ νόμου τεθεὶς τὸν πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἔπαυσε.* Just. Dial. cum Tryph. [11.]

Testament takes in the Gentiles also as well as Jews. Lastly, They differ likewise in their duration. The Old Testament was but to continue till Christ's first coming; the New to his second. The Old lasted no longer than Christ's descending from heaven, for himself to be judged by the sons of men; but the New is to last till his descending from heaven, to have the sons of men judged by himself. In a word, the Law was to last no longer than to the beginning of the Gospel; the Gospel is to last to the end of the world.

And thus we see in how many circumstances the Old and New Testament differ, yet notwithstanding they exactly agree in the substance. So that the one is not contrary to the other; what the one asserts, the other doth not deny; and what the one denies, the other doth not assert. And though the one only promises that Christ shall come, and the other assures us he is come; yet they both promise salvation only upon his account. So that the Fathers of the Old Testament were saved only by Christ, who was born after they were dead, as well as the children of the New Testament are saved by the same Christ, who was dead before they were born. And therefore *they are not to be heard*, or if they be heard, they are not to be believed, that *feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises;* which is a clear inference from the premises. For if the overtures of grace and life were made in Christ to them under the Law, as well as to us under the Gospel; it must needs follow, that the same promises that we have made to us under the Gospel were also made to them under the Law: and therefore the promises that we look for being spiritual, and not transitory, the promises that they looked for likewise were not only transitory, but also spiritual. The sum of all is this: Everlasting life and happiness was offered in Christ under the Old as well as under the New Testament. So that the old Fathers did not go one way to heaven and we another, but the same way that we go now they went then; and they had the same promises then that we have now. The truth whereof appeareth from scripture, reason, and Fathers.

And in producing of scripture for this, we may first take notice of the dawning of the gospel light to our first parents in that gracious promise; *It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel*[d], Gen. iii. 15. Where, after the Devil's conquest over man, man is immediately promised a greater conquest over him. And therefore, whether by the seed of the woman the person of Christ in particular, or the posterity of Adam in general is intended, be sure [e]Christ is promised; for in that it is a promise it must needs be made in him, *in whom all the promises are yea and amen*, 2 Cor. i. 20; and seeing the promise was made in him, he could not but be implied in the promise. As it was in the first Adam that the Devil conquered us, so it is only by the second Adam that we can conquer him. Which second Adam is here first promised to the first, that so we might all receive the promise of life in him, as we all fell into the threatened death by him. And that this was the promise of life, and so a spiritual promise, is clear, in that it is a promise of conquest over the father of death, the Devil. And that Christ is also promised in these words, appears in that it is he alone of all the seed of the woman that bruised the serpent's head. Indeed, Christ is so clearly promised in these words, that not only Christians, but the Jews themselves in their [f] Targum acknowledge and avouch it. And this was the only promise that we read of that the old world and many generations after had to live upon, and the only gospel to believe in, which, notwithstanding, was enough, yea as much as we have now for substance. For the same Christ was promised to them that is given to us, and they had as much cause to believe he would come, as we have to believe he is come. The reason why we so believe Christ is come, is because God hath told us he is so; and they had as much reason to believe he would come, seeing the same God had told them he would do so. And certainly their believing in him that was to come was as effectual to the justification of their persons, as our believing in him that is come; for it is not he as to come hereafter, or as come already, but as God-man, that is the Mediator betwixt God and man.

---

[d] The Hebrew words here, הוא ישופך ראש, being rendered by the vulgar Latin, *Ipsa conteret caput tuum*, the papists make use of this place to ground their *Μαριολατρεία* upon, as if the promise was to be understood concerning her, that she, viz. Mary, should bruise the serpent's head. And, to evade the force of the pronoun הוא, they would persuade us, that before the punctuation of the Bible or Hebrew text it was היא. But I would have them consider, 1. that the verb is in the masculine gender, as well as the pronoun הוא ישופך, and therefore if they turn הוא into היא, they must turn ישופך into תשופך too, or else make a false construction. 2. That all the Oriental translations read it הוא, not היא. For the Samaritan, both text and version, reads it, ࠄࠅࠀ, הוא: the Chaldee, הוא יהי, דכיר לך מה דעבדת ליה מלקדמין, *Ipse recordabitur tibi quæ ei fecisti in principio.* And so the Syriac, ܗܘ ܢܕܘܫ ܪܫܟ; *Ipsum conculcabit*, vel, *contundet caput tuum.* And so the Arabic also renders it, وهو يشدخ, *He shall break or bruise;* and though the Latin translation of the Arabic render it by *hæc*, it is not because the pronoun is feminine in the Arabic, but because the noun is feminine in the Latin wherewith it doth agree, viz. *stirps.* To this we might add, that the Persian also renders it by او and the Greek by *αὐτὸς*, which certainly they would not have done had they read היא and not הוא. So that the right translation of the words cannot be as the Latin, *Ipsa conteret caput tuum*, but rather as our English hath it, *It* (viz. the seed) *shall bruise thy head.*

[e] Deus omnipotens et clemens statim ut nos diabolica malignitas veneno suæ mortificavit invidiæ, prædestinata renovandis mortalibus suæ pietatis remedia inter ipsa mundi primordia præsignavit, denuncians serpenti futurum semen mulieris, quod noxii capitis elationem sua virtute contereret, Christum viz. in carne venturum, qui natus ex virgine violatorem humanæ propaginis incorrupta nativitate damnaret. Leo Serm. 2. de nativitate.

And this promise or abstract of the Gospel being made to Adam, the head of mankind, all mankind were interested in it, so that none of them that should act faith upon it but might receive life and salvation from it. And thus it continued for above two thousand years together, viz. from Adam to the flood, and from the flood to Abraham; at which time the most high God, seeing mankind in general faithless and unbelieving, was pleased to pick out from amongst them one person to manifest his love more graciously, and his promise or gospel more clearly to; and that was Abraham; who believing in the former promise or gospel made to Adam, and delivered down from Adam unto him, this his faith was accounted unto him for righteousness; and *being not yet circumcised*, the apostle tells us, *it was reckoned to him not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision*, Rom. iv. 10. But being first accounted righteous by the righteousness of the promised seed by faith applied by him, and through grace imputed to him, God was pleased to renew his covenant he had made in Adam with him, and to give him the seal of this the righteousness he had by faith, even circumcision, as the apostle informs us, saying, *And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised*, Rom. iv. 11. So that circumcision was not imputed to him for righteousness; but it was only [g] the seal of that righteousness of faith which was before imputed to him. He being accounted righteous by God, because believing in the promised Messiah, God gives him a sacrament or seal to confirm this his faith, even circumcision, which was as real and effectual a sacrament to him [h] as baptism is to us. For as baptism seals the righteousness of Christ to us, so did circumcision seal the same righteousness of the same Christ to them; only with this difference, that circumcision sealed to him and his posterity the righteousness of Christ, as to come hereafter; baptism seals to us the same righteousness of Christ, but as come already. From whence it clearly appears, that Abraham had the same righteousness that we have, and so the same promises that we have, and that it was in Christ that everlasting life was offered to him, as well as it is in Christ that everlasting life is promised to us.

---

[f] So we find in the Hierusalem Targum, Et erit, quando filii mulieris operam dabunt legi et fecerint mandata, studebunt tibi conterere caput et occident te. Quando vero relinquent filii mulieris legis præcepta nec servabunt mandata, tu operam dabis ut mordeas eos in calcaneis ipsorum, et ita noceas eis. Verum erit remedium filiis mulieris, tibi autem serpenti nullum erit remedium; quandoquidem futurum est ut ipsi alii aliis incolumitatem præstent in calcaneo בסוף עקב יומיא ביומוי דמלכא משיחא in fine extremitatis dierum in diebus regis Messiæ. Gen. iii. 15. Targ. Hier. And Jonathan's Targ. ועתידין אינון למעבד שפיותא בעיקבא ביומי מלכא משיחא. Quia illi futuri sunt adhibere medicinam calcaneo in diebus regis Messiæ. Ibid. Jonath.—Both intimating that this promise hath reference to the Messiah, and that the conquest that is here promised, the seed of the woman, shall only be by him.

---

[g] *Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀβραὰμ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ ὢν διὰ τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ ἐδικαιώθη, καὶ εὐλογήθη, ὡς ἡ γραφὴ σημαίνει· τὴν δὲ περιτομὴν εἰς σημεῖον, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς δικαιοσύνην ἔλαβεν.* Just. Dial. cum Tryph. [23.] *Ἐπειδὴ εἰς σημεῖον ἦν δεδομένη, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς δικαιοπραξίας ἔργον.* Ibid. *Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος σημεῖον αὐτὸ καλεῖ λέγων, Καὶ σημεῖον ἔδωκε περιτομῆς, σφραγῖδα· ὅτι γὰρ πρὸς τὴν δικαιοσύνην οὐδὲν αὐτὴ συντελεῖ· ἰδοὺ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ δίκαιος μηδέπω τῆς περιτομῆς νομοθετηθείσης πρὸς τοσαύτην ἔφθασεν ἀρετήν· καὶ τί λέγω; αὐτὸς ὁ πατριάρχης Ἀβραὰμ πρὶν ἢ τὴν περιτομὴν δέξασθαι, ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως μόνης ἐδικαιώθη.* Chrysost. in Gen. hom. 27. [vol. I. p. 207.]

[h] Ex quo enim instituta est circumcisio in populo Dei, quod erat tunc signaculum justitiæ fidei, ad significationem purgationis valebat et in parvulis originalis veterisque peccati, sicut et baptismus ex illo valere cœpit, ad innovationem hominis ex quo est institutus. Aug. de nuptiis et concupisc. ad Valer. l. 2. [24. vol. X. p. 313.] *Πιστεύσας γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβε τὴν περιτομὴν, σημεῖον οὖσαν τῆς διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀναγεννήσεως.* Athan. de sab. et circumcis. [vol. II. p. 58.] Quod vero apud nos valet aqua baptismatis, hoc egit apud veteres vel pro parvulis sola fides, vel pro majoribus virtus sacrificii, vel pro his qui ex Abrahæ stirpe prodierant mysterium circumcisionis. Gregor. Mag. Moral. l. 4. [præfat.] c. 3. Quis nesciat et alia præter baptismum contra originale peccatum remedia antiquis non defuisse temporibus? Abrahæ quidem et semini ejus circumcisionis sacramentum in hoc ipsum divinitus traditum est. Bernard. Epist. 77. [vol. II. p. 100.]

And thus the covenant of grace continued with no more than one seal annexed to it for above four hundred years together, viz. from Abraham till Moses, by whom God was pleased, for the further discovery of his love, and the confirmation of the righteousness of faith to Israel his people, the seed of Abraham, to institute another sacrament, viz. the paschal Lamb, Exod. xii., the more to confirm their faith in Christ, *the Lamb of God that should take away the sins of the world*, John i. 29, [i] whom the paschal lamb signified and represented to them, who was also *the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*, Rev. xiii. 8, being the substance of Abel's sacrifice as well as Moses's. So that all the beasts that were sacrificed from the beginning of the world till Christ's coming, were but as so many types of that sacrifice which he should offer for us, even himself. That blood should be shed it was necessary, because that *without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins*, Heb. x. 4; and therefore was all the blood that was shed before our Saviour's but as so many types and representations of his. For seeing that of the blood of bulls and goats, and the like, was made sin-offerings under the law, *sanctified to the purification of the*

---

[i] Τὸ *μυστήριον οὖν τοῦ προβάτου, ὃ τὸ πάσχα θύειν ἐντέταλται ὁ Θεὸς, τύπος ἦν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὗ τῷ αἵματι κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως χρίονται τοὺς οἴκους ἑαυτῶν, τουτέστιν ἑαυτοὺς, οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς αὐτόν.* Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. [40.] *Καὶ γὰρ τύπος ἦν ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἀμνὸς ἑτέρου ἀμνοῦ πνευματικοῦ καὶ πρόβατον προβάτου, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἦν σκιὰ, τὸ δὲ ἀλήθεια.* Chrysost. de prodit. Judæ, vol. V. p. 557. Et quemadmodum pascha, quod a Judæis celebratur in occisione agni, prænunciabat Domini passionem et transitum de hoc mundo ad Patrem, et ipsum tamen pascha, quod erat in eadem prænunciatione, idem Dominus cum discipulis suis celebravit. Aug. contra literas Petil. l. 2. [87. vol. IX.] v. et Cyprian. de resur. Christi; [ad calc.]

flesh, Heb. ix. 13, and yet the blood of goats could not expiate sin of itself, it follows, that the force and efficacy of all these sacrifices depended upon the relation they had to Christ: for it was not themselves, that typified the sacrifice of Christ, but it was the sacrifice of Christ, that was typified by them, that thus expiated the sins of the priests and people. And seeing there hath been such typifying sacrifices slain ever since the promise was first made to Adam, Christ is therefore said to be *the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*, viz. in all the sacrifices that were slain[k] as types of him. And from hence it is, that before our Saviour's coming, there was no nation under the sun but had their sacrifices. And the reason was, because the promise being made to Adam first, and in Adam to all mankind, mankind in general hath had some glimmerings of it, and so some confused notions of a sacrifice that must be offered for their sins. And though they perhaps looked no further than the sacrifices themselves offered, yet certainly there is none of their sacrifices but had at first their rise from, and always after, reference and relation to this only expiatory sacrifice of the Lamb of God thus slain from the foundation of the world.

But besides these two sacraments of the Old Testament, circumcision and the paschal lamb, the Jews had also other types of the sacraments under the New Testament: for *they were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea;* which was a type of baptism: and *they ate of the bread that came down from heaven*, and *drank of the water of the rock;* which was a clear type of the Lord's Supper. This the apostle himself observes, saying, *Moreover, brethren, I would not have you ignorant, how that all our fathers were under a cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink*

---

[k] In illis enim carnalibus victimis figuratio fuit carnis Christi, quam pro peccatis nostris ipse sine peccato fuerit oblaturus, et sanguinis quem erat diffusurus. Aug. de fide ad Pet. diac. [62. vol. VI. Append.] Hujus veri sacrificii multiplicia variaque signa erant sacrificia prisca sanctorum, cum hoc unum per multa figuraretur, tanquam verbis multis res una diceretur, ut sine fastidio multum commendaretur. Huic summo veroque sacrificio cuncta sacrificia falsa cesserunt. Id. [vol. VII.] de civit. Dei, l. 10. c. 20.

the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ, 1 Cor. x. 1—4. [l]So that what baptism is to us, the cloud and Red sea was a type of to them: and [m]as we eat the bread that came down from heaven, and drink the blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper; so did they eat the same spiritual meat, and drink the same spiritual drink too; for they drank of the Rock, *and that Rock was Christ.* Which is a clear proof, that the same Christ that is given unto us was also offered to them; and if Christ was offered to them, everlasting life must needs be offered in him, this being the only reason that we have the overture of him, even that we might enjoy everlasting life by him. So clear is the scripture in discovering to us, that even to the old Fathers, or Fathers of the Old Testament, everlasting life was offered, and that it was offered in Christ to them as well as to us, seeing that they had the knowledge of Christ as well as we; and therefore that they were not only transitory, but spiritual promises, which they did or ought to have looked after.

From express scripture if we proceed to reason, it will also discover this truth to us. For, first, that the Old and New Testament are not contrary to one another is clear, in that they were both written[n] by the same Spirit, *the Spirit of*

---

[l] That manna, and water out of the rock, typified our sacraments, the Fathers clearly teach. Τίνος ἕνεκεν ταῦτα λέγει; ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι ὥσπερ ἐκείνους οὐκ ὤνησε τὸ τοσαύτης ἀπολαῦσαι δωρεᾶς, οὕτως οὐδὲ τούτους τὸ βαπτίσματος τυχεῖν καὶ μυστηρίων πνευματικῶν ἀπολαῦσαι, εἰ μὴ μέλλοιεν ἄξιον τῆς χάριτος ἐπιδείκνυσθαι βίον, διὸ καὶ τοὺς τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ τοὺς τῶν μυστηρίων παράγει τύπους. Chrys. in 1 Corinth. hom. 23. [vol. III. p. 389.] And then, speaking of the people's being baptized into Moses, saith, Καὶ τοῦτο μὲν τοῦ λυτροῦ σύμβολον, τὰ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τῆς ἱερᾶς τραπέζης. Ibid. Hæc dicit spiritualia quia non mundi lege parata sunt, sed Dei virtute sine elementorum commixtione ad tempus creata, habentia in se figuram futuri mysterii, quod nunc sumimus in commemorationem Christi Domini. Ambros. in loc. [App. vol. II. p. 143.] Et adjungit, *Et omnes eundem potum spiritalem biberunt.* Aliud illi, aliud nos, sed specie visibili quod tamen hoc idem significaret virtute spiritali. Aug. in Joh. Tract. 26. [12. vol. III. par. ii.]

[m] Καθάπερ [γὰρ σὺ τὸ σῶμα ἐσθίεις τὸ δεσποτικὸν οὕτως ἐκεῖνοι τὸ μάννα· ὥσπερ] σὺ τὸ αἷμα πίνεις οὕτως ἐκεῖνοι ὕδωρ ἐκ πέτρας. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ αἰσθητὰ ἦν τὰ γινόμενα ἀλλὰ πνευματικῶς παρείχετο, οὐ κατὰ φύσεως ἀκολουθίαν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δωρεᾶς χάριν· καὶ μετὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἔτρεφεν εἰς πίστιν ἐνάγοντα. Chrysost. in 1 Corinth. hom. 23. [ibid.]

[n] Τοῦτο δὲ ἄνωθεν καὶ πρὸ πολλῶν χρόνων ὁ Δαβὶδ ἦν εἰρηκὼς ὅπερ ὁ

truth, which it is impossible should ever contradict itself. 2dly, That they looked for the same promises that we do is clear, 1. in that they were in the same covenant that we are, viz. in the covenant of grace, which was first made with Adam, and in him with all mankind that should lay hold upon it; and being in the same covenant, they could not but have the same spiritual promises which were all made in that covenant. 2. That they had the same promises made to them that are offered to us is clear, in that the same duties that are commanded us were also enjoined them, even to be holy in all manner of conversation, which holiness, the apostle tells us, hath *the promise both of this life, and also of that which is to come*, 1 Tim. iv. 8; and therefore to deny that they had spiritual as well as temporal promises, is to assert that none of them were holy; for if they were holy, they could not but have spiritual as well as temporal promises, all spiritual duties having spiritual promises annexed to them. 3. That they had not only transitory but spiritual promises appears from the promises themselves, which were spiritual as well as transitory. What more spiritual and excellent promise can we desire from God, or God make to us, than to be our God? Yet, besides many others, they had this promise under the Old as well as under the New Testament: for it was first made to Abraham and his seed, *And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee*, Gen. xvii. 7. And afterwards, the more to confirm our faith in it, he promises the same thing again; *And I will be their God, and they shall be my people*, Jer. xxxi. 33. What can we expect more from God, yea, to speak it with reverence, what can the great God himself promise more to us than this? What if the kingdom of heaven be not expressly mentioned in the Old Testament, is it not there said, *I will be their God?* And what is, if this be not, the kingdom of

---

Παῦλος παρήγαγε νῦν, δηλῶν ὅτι τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡ χάρις ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τότε καὶ νῦν ἐν ἡμῖν τὴν τῆς πίστεως ἐρρίζωσε δύναμιν· ὥστε ἔλεγε τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ λαλῆσαν, καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνήργησε· ποῦ νῦν εἰσὶν οἱ τὴν παλαιὰν διαβάλλοντες καὶ τὸ σῶμα τῆς γραφῆς διασπῶντες, καὶ τῇ καινῇ μὲν ἄλλον ἕτερον δὲ τῇ παλαιᾷ Θεὸν ἀπονέμοντες; Chrysost. εἰς τὸ, Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, vol. V. p. 376.

heaven? Certainly, should God have said, I will give them crowns and sceptres, heaven and happiness, such words would have come short of what is promised in these few words, *I will be their God.* So that should all the angels in heaven, and men on earth, study to eternity to find out a greater promise than this is, it would be impossible. Nay, indeed it is impossible that God himself should find out any thing more than himself to promise to his people. And yet even this the [o]head of all promises, comprehending all good things whatsoever, was made to them of the Old, as well as to us of the New Testament; and therefore, had they never another promise besides this, they could not but have all spiritual as well as transitory promises in this one.

And as the enjoyment of God, and so everlasting happiness, was promised in the Old as well as in the New Testament, so was it promised then too, as well as now, only in Jesus Christ; there being no other Mediator to reconcile God to us, and us to God, because none but he ever was or ever will be both God and man. And whosoever is God only and not man, or man only and not God, can never [p]mediate betwixt God and man. For he that is God only cannot suffer for man; and he that is man only cannot make satisfaction to God: and therefore to make a person capable of suffering for man and able to satisfy God, and so to mediate betwixt God and man, by suffering for the sins of the one and satisfying the justice of the other, it is necessary that himself participate of both natures, which being joined together in one Person might so be reconciled to one another. Now seeing there never was nor ever will be any such person in the world besides Christ, and seeing Christ was exactly such a person, perfect God and perfect man, it necessarily follows, that it was he, and he alone, that could be the Mediator betwixt God and man in the Old as well as in the New Testament: and so that whatsoever promises or overtures were made to the old Fathers were made only in him, without whom they could have enjoyed no mercy, nor have partaked any happiness, either in this world or that which is to come.

---

[o] Ὥστε εἶναί σου Θεός φησι, καὶ τοῦ σπέρματός σου μετὰ σέ· τοῦτο γάρ σοι ἔσται τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν ἀγαθῶν, σοί τε καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου. Chrysost. in Gen. hom. 39. [vol. I. p. 320.] ὁ γὰρ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης Θεὸς, ὁ τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸς, ὁ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ποιητής φησιν, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Θεός σου· μέγας ὁ ὄγκος τῆς τιμῆς τῆς εἰς τὸν δίκαιον. Ibid. [p. 318.] V. et Carthus. in loc.

[p] Ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἂν ἐγένετο μεσίτης, ἔδει γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ διαλέγεσθαι· Θεὸς οὐκ ἂν ἐγένετο μεσίτης, οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἷς ἐμισίτευσεν. Chrysost. in 1 Tim. hom. 7. [vol. IV. p. 277.]

And this was also the judgment of the primitive Church. [q] St. Chrysostome tells us, "There is no difference but of names in the two Testaments, no opposition or contrariety; for the Old is called Old from the New; but that is not from any opposition or contrariety, but the difference of the name only." And St. Ambrose; [r] "But there is one God in whom the doctrine of the Old and New Testament agreeth." And elsewhere; [s] "For our faith ariseth from the two Testaments; neither doth he wrong either that saith there is the like measure of perfect faith in both, when the Lord himself saith, *If you believed Moses, you would believe me also*, who was the Lord that spake also in Moses."

And before these Ignatius taught the same doctrine: [t] "For as the false prophets and false apostles received one and the same evil, deceitful, and seducing spirit, so did the prophets and apostles receive one and the same holy, good, leading, true, and teaching Spirit of God. For there is one God of the Old and New Testament, and one Mediator betwixt God and man, for the workmanship of the sensitive and intelligible creatures, and for the profitable and accommodate Providence over all things, and one Comforter working in Moses and the prophets and apostles. All the saints therefore were saved in Christ, trusting in him, and expecting of him." So that it was in Christ that the Fathers of the Old Testament received the Spirit of God, and salvation from him, as well as they of the New. So Irenæus also: [u]"The law did not forbid them to believe in the Son of God, but admonished them, saying, that men could not any other ways be saved from the wound of the old serpent, unless they believed in him, who, according to the likeness of sinful flesh, is upon the wood of martyrdom lifted up from the earth, and draws all things to himself, and quickens the dead."

---

[q] Ὥστε διαφορὰ μόνον ἐστὶν ὀνομάτων ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις, οὐ μάχη οὐδὲ ἐναντίωσις· τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν ἐκ τοῦ καινοῦ γίνεται παλαιὸν τοῦτο δὲ οὐ μάχης, οὐδὲ ἐναντιώσεως, ἀλλὰ διαφορᾶς ὀνόματος μόνης. Chrysost. εἰς τὸ Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, vol. V. p. 377.

[r] Sed unus Deus in quo et Novi et Veteris Testamenti doctrina concordat. Ambros. in Luc. 20. [vol. I. p. 1504.]

[s] Duobus enim Testamentis fides nostra consurgit, nec injuriam facit, qui parem dixerit in utroque perfectæ fidei mensuram: cum dicat ipse Dominus, *Si crederetis Moysi crederetis et mihi*, qui et in Moyse Dominus est locutus. Id. in Luc. 15. [Ibid. p. 1456.]

[t] Ὡς γὰρ οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ οἱ ψευδαπόστολοι ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἵλκυσαν πονηρὸν καὶ ἀπατηλὸν καὶ λαοπλάνον πνεῦμα· οὕτω καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἄγαθον, καὶ ἡγεμονικὸν, ἀληθές τε καὶ διδασκαλικὸν ἔλαβον παρὰ Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εὐθὲς πνεῦμα. Εἷς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς παλαιᾶς καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης· εἷς ὁ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, εἵς τε δημιουργίαν νοητῶν καὶ αἰσθητῶν καὶ πρόνοιαν πρόσφορον καὶ κατάλληλον· εἷς δὲ καὶ ὁ παράκλητος ὁ ἐνεργήσας ἐν Μωσεῖ καὶ προφήταις καὶ ἀποστόλοις· πάντες οὖν οἱ ἅγιοι ἐν Χριστῷ ἐσώθησαν, ἐλπίσαντες εἰς αὐτὸν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναμείναντες. Ignat. Epist. ad Philadelph. [p. 100.]

Lactantius hath also delivered his opinion very clearly in this point: [x]"But all the scripture," saith he, "is divided into two Testaments. That which was before the coming and passion of our Lord, to wit, the Law and Prophets, is called the Old; but those things that were written after his resurrection are called the New Testament. The Jews use the Old, we the New: but yet they are not diverse, because the New is the fulfilling of the Old, and in both Christ is the same testator, or the same Christ is testator."

St. Augustine hath also set down his judgment in this case: [y]"But the Old Testament, to them that rightly understand it, is a prophecy of the New Testament. And therefore in that first people, the holy patriarchs and prophets, who understood what they did, or what was done by them, had then the hope of eternal salvation in the New Testament: for what they understood and loved belonged unto that, which though it was not yet revealed, even then it was foretold and typified. But those belonged to the Old Testament who desired no more than the temporal promises there thought of, but did not understand the eternal promises that were typified and foretold in them." So that it was this renowned Father's opinion, that though there were many temporal promises made in the Old Testament, yet even under them spiritual blessings were promised, which they that understood the scriptures aright were throughly acquainted with, and therefore looked not for transitory promises only, but also spiritual, yea, for eternal salvation in Christ, promised in the Old, though revealed only in the New Testament. And therefore he saith elsewhere, [z] "Moses ate manna, and Aaron ate manna, and Phineas ate manna, and many that pleased God ate there, and are not dead (spiritually). Why? Because they understood the visible bread spiritually, hungered spiritually, tasted it spiritually, that so they might be satisfied spiritually."

---

[u] Non enim prohibebat (lex) eos credere in Filium Dei, sed adhortabatur, dicens, non aliter salvari homines ab antiqua serpentis plaga, nisi credant in eum, qui secundum similitudinem carnis peccati, in ligno martyrii exaltatur a terra, et omnia trahit ad se et vivificat mortuos. Iren. l. 4. [c. 2. 7.]

[x] Verum scriptura omnis in duo Testamenta divisa est. Illud quod adventum Domini passionemque antecessit, id est, Lex et Prophetæ, Vetus dicitur. Ea vero quæ post resurrectionem ejus scripta sunt, Novum Testamentum nominantur. Judæi Veteri utuntur, nos Novo. Sed tamen diversa non sunt, quia Novum Veteris adimpletio est, et in utroque idem testator est Christus. Lactant. de vera sap. [lib. IV. c. 20.]

[y] Vetus autem Testamentum recte intelligentibus prophetia est Novi Testamenti. Itaque et in illo primo populo sancti patriarchæ et prophetæ qui intelligebant quid agebant, vel quod per eos agebatur, in Novo Testamento habebant jam spem salutis æternæ. Ad illud enim pertinebat quod intelligebant et diligebant: quod etsi nondum revelabatur, jam tamen figurabatur. Ad Vetus autem illi pertinebant qui non illic amplius quam promissa temporalia cogitata concupiscebant, in quibus æterna figurata et prophetata non intelligebant. Aug. contra Faust. l. 15. c. 2. [vol. VIII.]

And that it was only by Christ that the old Fathers were justified and saved, Cyril of Alexandria hath a large discourse upon it, which he begins thus [a]: "But that the mystery of justification by faith had a more ancient original than circumcision in the law; and that it was foretold to Israel in types and figures, that they could not be saved any other way than by Christ only, that justifieth the ungodly and pardoneth sins; and also that they are the heirs of God, and are reckoned amongst his most legitimate children, who are of the promise made in Isaac to blessed Abraham; go on, let us now speak." And so he brings many arguments for what himself saith, and we have proved from scripture, reason, and Fathers, even that *the Old Testament is not contrary to the New*, and that both in the New and Old Testament eternal salvation *is offered to mankind* only by Christ, &c.

---

[z] Manducavit manna et Moses, manducavit manna et Aaron, manducavit manna et Phinees, manducaverunt ibi multi qui Domino placuerunt et mortui non sunt. Quare? Quia visibilem cibum spiritualiter intellexerunt, spiritualiter esurierunt, spiritualiter gustaverunt, ut spiritualiter satiarentur. Aug. in Joh. tract. 26. [11. vol. III. par. ii.]

[a] Ὅτι δὲ τῆς ἐν πίστει δικαιοσύνης τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἐν νόμῳ περιτομῆς πρεσβυτέραν ἔχει τὴν προανάρρησιν, καὶ ὅτι προκατεγράφετο τοῖς ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ τύπος τοῦ μὴ ἂν ἑτέρως δύνασθαι σωθῆναί ποτε, πλὴν ὅτι διὰ μόνου Χριστοῦ τοῦ δικαιοῦντος τὸν ἀσεβῆ καὶ ἀνίεντος ἐγκλήματα· καὶ πρός γε δὴ τούτοις ὅτι Θεοῦ κληρονόμοι, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὅτι μάλιστα γνησίοις κατατετάξονται τέκνοις, οἱ ἐκ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς ἐν Ἰσαὰκ γεγενημένης πρὸς τὸν μακάριον Ἀβραὰμ, φέρε δὴ λέγωμεν. Cyril. Alexandrin. Glaphyr. in Gen. l. 3. [init.]

Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

As every law whatsoever is either Divine or human, and every Divine law either published in scripture or implanted in nature; so every law that is published in scripture is either ceremonial, judicial, or moral: which distinction seems to be intimated in these words; [b] *Now these are the commandments, statutes, and the judgments, which the Lord commanded to teach you*, Deut. vi. 1: where by *commandments* we may understand the moral, by *statutes* the ceremonial, and by *judgments* the judicial law of God. Now what we ought to believe concerning these three laws is here set down in this part of the article.

---

[b] The Hebrews have an observation, that when חוק and משפט come together, the first signifies the ceremonial, the other the judicial law; and so they seem to signify here, וזאת המצוה החקים והמשפטים, "these are the commands, the ceremonies, and the judgments or judicial laws." So the vulgar Latin expressly, *Hæc sunt præcepta et ceremoniæ atque judicia:* and so the Syriac translation seems to imply, ܗܠܝܢ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܘܢܡܘܣܐ ܘܕܝܢܐ, *Hæc sunt præcepta et leges atque judicia*, where ܢܡܘܣܐ, *νόμοι*, denotes the ceremonial, and ܕܝܢܐ, *judicia*, the judicial laws. And so the word חקים is to be taken too in the 17th verse of this chapter, viz. Deut. vi., where it is said, שמור תשמרון את מצות יהוה אלהיכם ועדותיו וחקיו אשר צוך, *Custodiendo custodietis præcepta Domini Dei vestri et testimonia ejus et statuta ejus quæ præcepit tibi;* where חקים, *statuta*, the Syriac renders again by ܢܡܘܣܐ, *νόμοι*, the vulgar Latin expressly *ceremonias*. The Septuagint there and elsewhere usually renders it by δικαιώματα, which properly signifies *præcepta*, or, *mandata Dei de externis ceremoniis*, and so is always distinguished from ἐντολαὶ, *præcepta moralia*.

First, concerning the ceremonial law, it is here said, *Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men*, implying, that that law is now of no force and virtue in obliging us to obedience, as it did the Jews: where we may briefly consider, first, what this law was; secondly, how it appears to be now disannulled. As for the first, what this law was, it is plain that it was that law whereby God was pleased to determine the outward circumstances of his own worship, and the outward performances of his people's lives, containing several precepts: 1st, Concerning their sacraments, viz. circumcision, and the eating of the paschal lamb; to which may be added also the eating of the shew-bread, and their purification from several uncleannesses, as when any one was a leper, had touched a dead body, or the like. 2dly, Concerning their sacrifices; whether sin-offerings, or heave-offerings, or burnt-offerings; whether offered by the high priest only, by the ordinary priest, by all the people, or private persons; as also whether they were of living creatures, as goats or kids, rams or lambs, heifers or calves, doves or turtles; or inanimate, as bread or wine or oil. 3dly, Concerning their holy things: as, first, their holy places; as the tabernacle and temple, the one carried up and down, the other fixed, divided into three parts; the holy of holies, where the high priest only came, and that but once a year; the sanctuary, where the ordinary priests went continually; and the outward court, where the people stood: secondly, holy times; as their sabbaths, new moons, passover, pentecost, feast of tabernacles, the feast of in-gathering, the feast of trumpets, the day of atonement, Lev. xxiii.; the sabbatical year also, and the year of jubilee. 4thly, Concerning outward observances in priests or people; as, not to eat such and such flesh, not to wear such and such clothes, not to plough with an ox and an ass together, and such like. Thus we see what these ceremonies and rites were. Now, secondly, that they are not obligatory unto us, as they were to the Jews, appears from the determination of that canonical synod holden by the apostles themselves at Hierusalem, Acts xv. where this question being debated, whether circumcision, and so the other ceremonies of the law, should be enjoined the Gentiles, they determined it in the negative, that the Gentiles which were turned to God should not be troubled with these things. Hence it is that we read St. Paul, writing to the Colossians, *Let no man therefore judge you either in meat or drink, or in respect of a holy day, new moon, or sabbath days*, Col. ii. 16; and to the Galatians, *If you be circumcised, Christ profiteth you nothing*, Gal. v. 2. And he acquaints the Hebrews with the reason of it; *For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law*, Heb. vii. 12, viz. the ceremonial law, which being at the first instituted and imposed only *until the time of reformation*, Heb. ix. 10, even until the coming of Christ, who was the substance of those shadows and the truth of those types, there was no need of them when once himself was come, nor indeed any law for them. For seeing the law enjoined them for no longer a time than till Christ was come, and the time in his coming being expired, the law enforcing them must needs be disannulled. So that now we are no ways bound to use any of the aforesaid ceremonies, they being no furtherances now, as they were under the law, but rather [c] hinderances of our faith in Christ the substance: but they are to us Christians as if they had never been imposed at all upon the Jews, even without any binding or obligatory force at all in them [d], as the Fathers taught of old.

---

[c] Cecidit Hierusalem, cecidit templum, altare sublatum est, &c. Ratio autem qua hæc cuncta desinerent illa est, ut omne os obstruatur, et subditus fiat omnis mundus Deo, ne qui forte ex incredulo populo occasiones suæ infidelitatis acciperent, et habentes umbras antiquitus sibi traditas, vel templi vel altaris vel pontificii vel sacerdotii, viderentur sibi permanente antiqui cultus statu prævaricari religionis ordinem, si transiret ad fidem. Propterea ergo auferri hæc omnia, quæ in terris dudum fuerant adumbrata, divina providentia dispensavit, ut viam quodammodo accipiant requirendæ veritatis cessantibus typis. Orig. in Jes. Nave, hom. 17. [vol. II. p. 437.]

[d] Εἰ γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ οὐκ ἦν χρεία περιτομῆς, οὐδὲ πρὸ Μωϋσέως σαββατισμοῦ καὶ ἑορτῶν καὶ προσφορῶν, οὐδὲ νῦν μετὰ τὸν κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, δίχα ἁμαρτίας τῆς ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ παρθένου γεννηθέντα Υἱὸν Θεοῦ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, ὁμοίως ἐστὶ χρεία. Just. Dial. cum Tryph. [23.] Ὡς οὖν ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἤρξατο περιτομὴ, καὶ ἀπὸ Μωσέως σάββατον καὶ θυσίαι καὶ προσφοραὶ καὶ ἑορταὶ, καὶ ἀπεδείχθη διὰ τὸ σκληροκάρδιον τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν ταῦτα διατετάχθαι, οὕτως παύσασθαι ἔδει κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς βουλὴν εἰς τὸν διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ φυλῆς Ἰούδα καὶ Δαβὶδ παρθένου γεννηθέντα Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστόν. Ibid. [43.] Καὶ τοῦτο πάσχει παρὰ τὸ ἀγνοεῖν, ὅτι ἡ σωματικὴ τοῦ νόμου

Secondly, Of the judicial law it is here said, *nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth: civil precepts;* that is, whatsoever precepts we find in the law of Moses concerning state-polity, or the civil government of the Jewish nations; as concerning their magistrates, contracts, distribution of inheritances, witnesses, several punishments of blasphemy, perjury, and the like. These laws, though they could not without sin have been neglected by the Jews, yet it is here said there is no necessity of their being received into other commonwealths; which certainly there is not. For though these laws were made by God, and so were certainly the best that ever were or can be made, yet seeing they were made only for that

---

τήρησις, ἐπὶ τῇ ἐπιδημίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατήργηται, τῶν τύπων λοιπὸν μεταληφθέντων εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν· ἀργοῦσι γὰρ οἱ λύχνοι τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου παρουσίᾳ· καὶ σχολάζει ὁ νόμος, καὶ οἱ προφῆται κατασιγάζονται τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναφανείσης. Basil. de S. Spiritu, [vol. II.] c. 21. And St. Chrysostome proves it excellently out of the law itself, that its ceremonies were to cease in Christ: Καὶ ποῦ τοῦτο (νόμος) εἶπε, φησὶν, ὅτι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται; οὐκ εἶπε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ πραγμάτων ἔδειξε· καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τῷ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὴν ἁγιστείαν ἅπασαν ἐν ἑνὶ κατακλεῖσαι τόπῳ τῷ ναῷ, καὶ αὐτὸν ὕστερον καθελεῖν· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐβούλετο αὐτὰς παύσασθαι, καὶ τὸν περὶ τούτων νόμον ἅπαντα, δυοῖν θάτερον ἂν ἐποίησεν, ἢ οὐκ ἂν καθεῖλε τὸν ναὸν, ἢ καθελὼν οὐκ ἂν ἀπηγόρευσεν ἀλλαχοῦ θύεσθαι· νῦν δὲ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν καὶ αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἄβατον ταῖς τοιαύταις κατέστησεν ἱερουργίαις· μόνον δὲ τὸν ναὸν αὐταῖς ἀνεὶς καὶ ἀποτάξας, εἶτα αὐτὸν τοῦτον ὕστερον καθελὼν, καὶ εἰς τέλος ἔδειξε διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶν, ὅτι πέπαυται τὰ τοῦ νόμου διὰ Χριστοῦ· καὶ γὰρ τὸν ναὸν καθεῖλεν ὁ Χριστός. Chrysost. in 2 Cor. hom. 7. vol. III. p. 587. St. Austin also and St. Hierome both acknowledged this truth, but yet had some difference about it; the one, St. Austin, holding that now it is lawful not to observe the ceremonial law, but it is not sinful to observe it; so that it is not binding to any, neither is any bound to omit the observation of it, the things not being in themselves sinful, but indifferent; Quapropter non ideo Petrum emendavit (Paulus) quod paternas traditiones observaret, quod si facere vellet, nec mendaciter nec incongrue faceret: quamvis enim jam superflua, tamen solita non nocerent. Aug. Epist. [40. 5. vol. II.] ad beatum Hieronymum. But St. Hierome held it was now utterly unlawful to use any of them, and therefore writes back again to St. Augustine, and amongst other things in his epistle tells him, Ego e contrario loquar, et reclamante mundo libera voce pronunciem, ceremonias Judæorum et perniciosas esse et mortiferas Christianis. Et quicunque eas observaverit sive ex Judæis sive ex gentibus, eum in barathrum diaboli devolutum. Hieron. Epist. ad Augustinum. [Ibid. 75. 14.] And certainly to use them now under the same notion as they were used before Christ's coming, we cannot but acknowledge with St. Hierome, it is altogether sinful. But to use some of them without any respect at all to the law that commanded them, the things not being in themselves sinful, it must needs be acknowledged with St. Augustine to be lawful.

nation, other nations are not also bound to observe them, especially considering that the temper and condition of other nations may be much different from that; and therefore, though they were the best that could be conceived for them, yet may better be found out for others; better I say, not simply, but by reason of the circumstances of time, place, and conditions, which the other nations may lie under. And further, had God intended these laws for other nations as well as for the Jews, there would have been some particular command in scripture to bind other nations to their observance; which be sure there is not: but we are rather commanded to obey other laws, as St. Paul writes to the Romans, to *be subject to the highest powers*, Rom. xiv. 1; wherein, but in obeying their lawful commands, which certainly were much different from the laws established by Moses? And the great God, by St. Peter, commands us to *submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake*, 1 Pet. ii. 13; in which Epistle St. Peter doth not write to any particular city or people or person, but it is a general epistle directed to all Christians whatsoever: so that wheresoever they be, they are still bound, not to the civil precepts of Moses, but the lawful commands of their present superiors, even to *every ordinance of man*, and that *for the Lord's sake.*

But the principal thing here to be treated of is the third, to wit, the moral law, of which it is here said, that although the ceremonial and judicial laws of Moses aforesaid do not bind Christian men or magistrates, *yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called Moral;* that is, of those commandments that enjoin us our duty towards God and our neighbours, contained in the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments, and repeated and explained in other places of the Bible. Which commands were first written upon the fleshly tables of our hearts; but [e] because man became a stranger to himself, scarce knowing what he knew, God was pleased solemnly to publish and promulge them in the ears of all his people, Deut. v. 22. And herein they had the preeminence before the ceremonial and civil precepts which God gave to Moses by himself, ver. 31: neither was he pleased only to publish them, but he wrote them also afterwards upon two tables of stone, the better to keep them in their memory, Exod. xxxii. 15, 16. And in this also they had the preeminence above the others, in that these moral commands were written by Jehovah himself, the other from him indeed, but not by him, but only by Moses his servant, Exod. xxiv. 4. And therefore though the other laws were commanded by the same God that these are, and therefore were as obligatory to the Jews for the present; yet seeing these had so much preeminence before the others in their promulgation, they may well be thought to have as much in their obligation. So that though the others have lost their virtue, these still retain their force upon the conscience, so as to bind and oblige not only Jews but Christians, yea, all the world, to obey and act according unto them. Insomuch that no man whatsoever, high or low, rich or poor, is free from performing obedience unto them; but be he what he will, he sins unless he obey them. Though a man may omit the observation of the other laws and not sin, yet he cannot but sin if he omit the observation of these; so that not one person in the world is free from giving obedience to the moral, though all the persons in the world are free from the observation of the ceremonial and judicial laws.

---

[e] Quandoquidem manu formatoris nostri in ipsis cordibus nostris veritas scripsit, Quod tibi non vis fieri ne facias alteri: hoc et antequam lex daretur nemo ignorare permissus est, ut esset unde judicarentur et quibus lex non esset data. Sed ne sibi homines aliquid defuisse quererentur, scriptum est et in tabulis quod in cordibus non legebant. Non enim et scriptum non habebant, sed legere nolebant. Oppositum est

And this appears, first, from scripture. And indeed was there never a place of scripture to prove this truth, yet seeing there is never a place of scripture to prove the contrary, that would be a sufficient proof of it. For that this moral law was once established by God, as well as the ceremonial and

oculis eorum quod in conscientia videre cogerentur, et quasi forinsecus admota voce Dei ad interiora sua homo compulsus est, dicente scriptura, In cogitationibus enim impii, interrogatio est; ubi interrogatio ibi lex. Sed quia homines appetentes ea quæ foris sunt, etiam a seipsis exules facti sunt, data est etiam conscripta lex, non quia in cordibus scripta non erat, sed quia tu fugitivus eras cordis tui. Aug. in Psal. lvii. [1. vol. IV.]

judicial, it cannot be denied: and what law is once established by God must needs stand in force until repealed by the same authority that established it; and therefore until God hath repealed this, as he hath done the other laws, it must needs still remain in full force and virtue. And therefore to say the scripture is not against this truth, is as much as to say the scripture is for it; for if the scripture do nowhere express the abrogation and abolishment of this, as it doth of the other laws, it necessarily follows that this law is not abrogated as the others be, but still binds the conscience as the others do not.

But besides that there is no express scripture against this truth, there be many express scriptures for it; yea, our Lord Christ himself, the maker of all the laws, tells us of this the moral law, he did not come to destroy it; *Think not that I am come*, saith he, *to destroy the Law, or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil*[f], Matt. v. 17. He did not come to take any force from it, but rather to give more unto it; and therefore when one came unto him, saying, *Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?* he answered him, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which?* Christ answered, *Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, Matt. xix. 16—19. Where we may see how the same Christ that requireth faith in his person commandeth obedience to his precepts; whereby, though he doth not confirm but repeal the ceremonial and judicial, he doth not repeal but confirm the moral laws: for in commanding obedience to them in the New Testament, he both continues and confirms the obligatory power he had put into them in the Old: so that we are now so far from being free from them, that we are more bound than before to perform obedience to them. As Peter is said to be *bound with two chains*, Acts xii. 6; so are we now bound to the obligation of the law as it were with a double cord; the one made by God our Maker, the other by God-man our Mediator. Hence it is that the apostle saith, *Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law*, Rom. iii. 31. So that the law is so far from being abolished, that it is established by [g]faith, even by that faith that justifies a sinner, which the law without faith could never do; and therefore it is established by its attaining that end for which it was at the first enacted, even the justification of such as were subject to it. Nay, and further, the law through Christ is also established, by having perfect obedience performed to it, which without him it could never have had: all other persons in the world that were made under the law were transgressors of it, but only he who was perfectly obedient unto it. And so he did not teach us by precept only, but by example also, to obey the moral law.

---

[f] Ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι· τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ Ἰουδαίων ἐμφράττει τὴν ἀναισχυντίαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἀπορράπτει τὰ στόματα, τῶν ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου λεγόντων εἶναι τὴν παλαιάν· εἰ γὰρ καταλῦσαι τὴν ἐκείνου τυραννίδα παρεγένετο ὁ Χριστὸς, πῶς ταύτην οὐ μόνον οὐ καταλύει, ἀλλὰ καὶ πληροῖ; οὐ γὰρ μόνον εἴρηκεν, ὅτι οὐ καταλύω (καίτοι ἤρκει τοῦτο) ἀλλὰ ὅτι καὶ πληρῶ· ὅπερ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐναντιουμένου ἦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ συγκροτοῦντος αὐτήν. Chrysost. in Mat. hom. 16. [vol. II. p. 107.]

Which things being considered, though we cannot deny but that we are *redeemed by Christ from the curse of the law*, Gal. iii. 13, from being justified only by the law, and from the rigour of the law, that it would accept of no obedience but what was[h] every way perfect and complete; I say, though we may be said to be thus free from the law, yet we are not free from performing obedience unto it. So that we Christians, that believe in a crucified Jesus, are bound to keep the moral law, as well as the Jews that expect a promised Messiah.

---

[g] *Καὶ πῶς ἔστησε, φησί; τί ἦν τοῦ νόμου τὸ ἔργον; καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν ἅπαντα ἔπραττεν; ὥστε δίκαιον ποιῆσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον· ἀλλ᾽ ἐκεῖνος μὲν τοῦτο οὐκ ἴσχυσε, πάντες γὰρ, φησὶν, ἥμαρτον· ἡ πίστις δὲ ἐλθοῦσα αὐτὸ κατώρθωσεν· ὁμοῦ γὰρ τὶς ἐπίστευσε, καὶ ἐδικαιώθη· οὐκοῦν ἔστησε τοῦ νόμου τὸ θέλημα, καὶ δι᾽ ὃ πάντα ἔπραττεν ἐκεῖνος, τοῦτο αὐτὴ εἰς τέλος ἤγαγεν· οὐκ ἄρα αὐτὸν κατήργησεν ἀλλ᾽ ἀπήρτισε.* Chrysost. in Roman. hom. 7. [vol. III. p. 48.]

[h] St. Chrysostome sheweth excellently, how the law required obedience in the most exact and rigorous manner; so that if a man fail but in one thing, he is guilty of the breach of all. *Διὸ καὶ πολλὰ ἐφέλκεται καὶ διὰ τῆς μιᾶς ἐντολῆς ὁ νόμος· ἂν τοίνυν περιτμηθῇς, μὴ ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ· ἢ ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ μὲν, μὴ οὔσης δὲ θυσίας· θυσίας δὲ οὔσης μὴ ἐν τῷ ὡρισμένῳ δὲ τρόπῳ· μὴ τὰ νενομισμένα δέ· ἢ τὰ νενομισμένα μὲν, μὴ καθαρὸς δὲ ὤν· ἢ καθαρὸς μὲν ὢν οὐ τοῖς προσήκουσι δὲ θεσμοῖς καθαρθεὶς, πάντα οἴχεται ἐκεῖνα.* Chrysost. in Gal. c. 5. [vol. III. p. 750.]

But after scripture, reason itself may plead in this case. For, 1, the moral law is that eternal, unchangeable rule of justice and equity, that is infinitely and incomprehensibly in God. Yea, the eternal will of God itself is the fountain of this law, as well as this law is to be the rule of our lives. Nay, the moral law is indeed nothing else but the unchangeable will of God, revealed for the instruction and direction of man: so that to say the moral law is abolished, is as much as to say the will of God is changed, which is impossible it should ever do. 2. The moral law was established before Christ was promised; nay, Christ was not promised before that law was transgressed; nay, therefore, because the law was transgressed, therefore I say was Christ promised. So that the reason of Christ's being promised, and the end of his being incarnate, was not that he might break and disannul, but that he might bind and confirm the law. Again, the ceremonial laws and judicial also began in Moses, and therefore might well end in Christ: but the moral law was implanted[1] in the soul as soon as the soul was breathed into the body, which our Saviour intimates when he saith, *Moses suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so,* Matt. xix. 8; implying that the moral law was before Moses, even from the beginning; and if it was from the beginning, it will certainly be till the end of the world. For seeing it was from the beginning, it must needs be planted in the soul by the finger of God himself; and that which God the Father planted, be sure God the Son never plucked up. Especially considering, 3, that the moral law was not made only for one particular time or people, as the ceremonial and judicial were, which were made only for the nation of the Jews, and to last no longer than the coming of the promised Messiah; but the moral was made for a standing law to all nations, and that to the end of the world. And therefore it is that they that never heard of the law of Moses preached and explained to them, have this law written and engraven in them; so that, will they nill they, their own consciences will force them to acknowledge that God ought to be worshipped, and their neighbours righted; which is the sum of this moral law; insomuch that we need not produce any more arguments to convince any one that they ought to obey this law; for every one hath an unanswerable argument in his own breast, every man's conscience forcing him to confess what this Article asserts, that he is not free from the obedience of the laws which are called moral.

---

[1] Ἡ γὰρ φύσις ὑπαγορεύει τοὺς νόμους· οἴδαμεν ἐξ ἑαυτῶν τί καλὸν καὶ τί πονηρόν· ἔθηκεν ὁ Θεὸς νόμον ἐν τῇ φύσει ἄγραφον, τὸν φωτίζοντα ἡμῶν τὰς διανοίας· μηδεὶς λεγέτω οὐκ ἀνέγνων νόμον, οὐκ οἶδα τὰ τοῦ νόμου· ἐὰν γὰρ ἀρνήσῃ τὸν κοινὸν νόμον, ἐλέγχει σε ὁ τῆς φύσεως νόμος· θέλεις μαθεῖν ὅτι ἐν τῇ φύσει ἔπηξεν ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς νόμους τοὺς διακρίνοντας τί καλὸν καὶ τί πονηρόν; Chrysost. περὶ πίστεως καὶ εἰς τὸν περὶ φύσεως νόμον. Vol. VI. p. 839. Quod ergo tibi non vis fieri noli alteri facere. Judicas enim malum esse in eo quod pati non vis: et hoc te cogit nosse lex intima, in ipso tuo corde conscripta. Aug. in Ps. lvii. [1. vol. IV.]

To scripture and reason we might in the next place add the Fathers. But seeing it is a truth so generally received by all men, though not in their lives, yet in their consciences, I shall pick out some few of them to speak for the rest, not only of the Fathers, but of their fellow-creatures. First, Clemens Romanus, who having shewed how it is only by faith in Christ that we are justified before God, lest any one should take occasion from thence to think obedience to the law superfluous, presently adds, [k]"What therefore shall we do, brethren? Shall we cease from doing good, and forsake charity? The Lord by no means will suffer that to be done by us. Let us haste with diligence and alacrity to perfect every good work." And afterwards, [l]"We see how all just persons are adorned with good works, and the Lord himself rejoiceth to adorn himself with works. Having therefore this example, let us diligently obey his will, and with all our strength work the work of righteousness." Where we may observe, 1, how such as are just do not therefore lay aside good works because justified by Christ; but because justified by Christ they therefore adorn themselves with good works: and, 2, that God himself adorns himself with good works, and therefore certainly we cannot be free from them, who are bound to be like him, 1 Pet. i. 15.

---

[k] Τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν ἀδελφοί; ἀργάσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγαθοποιΐας καὶ ἐγκαταλείπωμεν τὴν ἀγάπην; μηδαμῶς τοῦτο ἐάσαι ὁ δεσπότης ἐφ᾽ ἡμῖν γεγενηθῆναι· ἀλλὰ σπεύσωμεν μετ᾽ ἐκτενείας καὶ προθυμίας πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελεῖν. Clem. Epist. ad Corinth. [p. 41.]

[l] Ἴδωμεν ὅτι τὸ ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς πάντες ἐκοσμήθησαν οἱ δίκαιοι· καὶ αὐτὸς οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἔργοις ἑαυτὸν κοσμήσας ἐχάρη· Ἔχοντες οὖν τοῦτον τὸν ὑπογραμμὸν ἀόκνως προσέλθωμεν τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ, ἐξ ὅλης ἰσχύος ἡμῶν ἐργασώμεθα ἔργον δικαιοσύνης. Ibid. [p. 43.]

St. Basil also shews how the same things are commanded in the New Testament that were commanded in the Old, [m]"That the Lord both in the Old and New Testament hath the same end in his commands, even to meet with the effects of sin, and to cut wickedness off in the very first beginning. For as the old law said, *Thou shalt not commit adultery;* but the Lord Christ, *Thou shalt not covet:* and that, *Thou shalt not steal* [*kill*]; but he, commanding perfecter things, *Thou shalt not be angry:* so here, the law is content with swearing aright, but he cutteth off the very occasion of perjury." So that the same law is not only now in force that it was before, but that also in a stricter sense; and therefore he saith elsewhere, "That *Christ*[n] *came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil them*, and to add more perfect things to them."

And so the same Father again in another place speaks fully to our purpose. "But [o]because of those things that are in use with us, some are delivered by the command of God in the holy scripture, others passed by in silence: concerning these things that are written, there is no power given to any one whatsoever, either to do any thing that is forbidden, or to leave undone any thing that is commanded."

Irenæus also speaking of our Saviour's exposition of the law, Matt. v., saith, [p]"For all these things do not contain any contrariety or dissolution of the ancient moral laws, as they that hold with Marcion talk, but their fulness and extension, as himself saith, *Unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.*"

---

[m] Ὅτι πανταχοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σκοποῦ ἔχεται ὁ Κύριος, προλαμβάνων ἁμαρτημάτων τὰ ἀποτελέσματα, καὶ ἐκ τῆς πρώτης ἀρχῆς ἐκτέμνων τὴν πονηρίαν· ὡς γὰρ ὁ μὲν παλαιὸς ἔλεγε νόμος οὐ μοιχεύσεις, ὁ δὲ Κύριος οὐδὲ ἐπιθυμήσεις· κἀκεῖνος μὲν οὐ φονεύσεις, ὁ δὲ τὰ τελειότερα νομοθετῶν οὐδὲ ὀργισθήσῃ· οὕτως δὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὁ μὲν ἀρκεῖται τῇ εὐορκίᾳ, ὁ δὲ τῆς ἐπιορκίας τὴν ἀφορμὴν διακόπτει. Basil. in Psa. 14. [p. 133. vol. I.]

[n] Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ νομίζειν ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν τὸν Κύριον ἐληλυθέναι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πληρώσει καὶ προσθήκῃ τῶν τελειότερων. Id. Moral. reg. 42. [vol. II.]

[o] Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν στρεφομένων πραγμάτων τὰ μέν ἐστιν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ γραφῇ διεσταλμένα, τὰ δὲ σεσιωπημένα· περὶ μὲν τῶν γεγραμμένων οὐδεμία ἐξουσία δέδοται καθόλου οὐδενὶ, οὔτε ποιῆσαί τι τῶν κεκωλυμένων, οὔτε παραλεῖψαί τι τῶν προστεταγμένων. Id. Reg. brevior. interrog. 1. [vol. II.]

[p] Omnia enim hæc non contrarietatem et dissolutionem præteritorum continent, sicut qui a Marcione sunt vociferantur; sed plenitudinem et extensionem, sicut ipse ait, *Nisi abundaverit justitia vestra plusquam Scribarum et Pharisæorum, non intrabitis in regnum cælorum.* [Iren. adv. hæres. l. IV. c. 13. 1.]

I shall trouble no more of the Fathers in so clear and undoubted a truth, but only St. Augustine: "For if we [q] distinguish betwixt the two Testaments, the Old and the New, the sacraments are not the same, nor the promises the same, but the precepts are for the most part the same. For, *Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Honour thy father and thy mother, Do not bear false witness, Do not covet thy neighbour's goods, Do not covet thy neighbour's wife,* are commands which are laid also upon us, and whosoever doth not observe them erreth." And Gregorius Neocæsariensis, or Thaumaturgus, who tells us, [r] "God the Lord and beholder of all things is to be feared in the first place, and his commands are to be observed; and let every one be fully persuaded that all things must hereafter be brought to judgment, and every one shall receive according to the merit of their works, whether they be good or evil." Concluding this as Olympiodorus doth his comment upon Ecclesiastes: "But now [s] we being so well taught by the Preacher, let us fear God and keep his commandments with all our diligence and study: for all our salvation is laid up in the mercies of the Lord, and the clemency of the Judge, *with whom, and by whom, to God the Father and Holy Spirit, be glory now and for evermore.* Amen."

---

[q] Si enim discernimus duo Testamenta, vetus et novum, non sunt eadem sacramenta, nec eadem promissa, eadem tamen pleraque præcepta. Nam, non occides, non mœchaberis, non furaberis, honora patrem et matrem, non falsum testimonium dixeris, non concupisces rem proximi tui, non concupisces uxorem proximi tui, et nobis præceptum est: et quisquis ea non observaverit deviat. Aug. in Psa. 73. [2. vol. IV.]

[r] Timendus ante omnia Deus omnium Dominus simul et inspector: observanda item mandata ipsius, et persuasum habeat unusquisque omnia posthæc judicanda, et singulos juxta merita operum sive bona sive mala retributionem accepturos. Gregor. Neocæs. in Eccles. [apud Bibl. Max. Patr. p. 326. vol. III.]

[s] Nos autem bene jam per Ecclesiasten edocti timeamus Deum, et illius mandata custodiamus, omni nostra contentione et studio: summa enim salutis nostræ in misericordiis Domini ac benignitate judicis reposita est; cum quo et per quem Deo Patri est gloria, Sanctoque Spiritui et nunc et in secula seculorum. Amen. Olympiodor. in Eccles. fin. [Ibid. p. 519. vol. XVIII.]

ARTICLE VIII.

OF THE THREE CREEDS.

The Three Creeds, Nice Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought throughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy scripture.

OUR Saviour immediately before his ascension commanded baptism to be administered *in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, Matt. xxviii. 19; his church[a] hath therefore in all ages required the profession of faith in these three Persons of all that were to be baptized: and therefore, to prepare her catechumeni for baptism, she hath still instructed them in what they ought to believe concerning each Person, which when they had learned, acknowledged, and professed, either by themselves or their sureties, they were presently received by baptism into the church of Christ.

Now for the better understanding of what they were bound thus to acknowledge, the church used still to give them, in plain and familiar terms, a brief but full explication and description of every Person in whose names they were to be baptized; which explication or description of the Persons in the Holy Trinity was afterwards called *the* [b] *symbol*, *creed*, or *rule of faith*, because it contained whatsoever was necessary to be believed and acknowledged in order to baptism. Now the church of Christ being scattered abroad into several nations and countries much distant one from another, and yet each particular church still retaining the same way of fitting her *catechumeni* and [c] *competentes* for baptism, though they all agreed in setting down the three Persons themselves in their Creeds, yet they differed something in the explication of them; some giving it in more, others in fewer terms, but still retaining the same order, first setting down the Father, then the Son, and then the Holy Ghost. And hence it is that there have been so many creeds composed since our Saviour's time, all differing in some circumstances, though all agreeing in the substance, viz. *We believe in the Father*, *Son*, *and Holy Ghost*, which is the sum and substance of them all.

---

[a] That the ancients made this place the ground of their creeds, we may see in Eusebius, who, having presented his creed to the council of Nice, after he had rehearsed it, adds, *Καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς εἶπε· πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, &c. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. 1. *κεφ.* [*η*. p. 23. vol. II.] And so Arius and Euzoius having delivered their creed to Constantine, they add, *Ταύτην δὲ τὴν πίστιν παρειλήφαμεν ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων Εὐαγγελίων, λέγοντος τοῦ Κυρίου τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς, πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε*, &c. Ibid. *κεφ. κϛ*. Gr. c. 19. Lat. And so St. Basil, after he had set down his confession of faith or creed, adds, *Οὕτως φρονοῦμεν, καὶ οὕτως βαπτίζομεν εἰς Τριάδα ὁμοούσιον κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰπόντος, πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.* Basil. de vera fide. [p. 390. vol. II.]

---

[b] So called, as some of old thought, from the Greek word signifying *a collation:* Quod enim Græce symbolum dicitur Latine collatio nominatur. Serm. de temp. [241. Aug. p. 395. Append. vol. V.] Symbolum Græce collatio, hoc est quod plures in unum conferunt. Rab. Maur. de instit. cler. l. 2. c. 56. [vol. VI.] v. et Eucher. de symb. homil. 1. But these, and others, it seemed, not so well skilled in the Greek language, confounded *σύμβολον* with *συμβολή*. For it is *συμβολὴ*, not *σύμβολον*, that signifies a collation. So Athenæus saith, *συμβολὴν τὴν εἰς τὰ συμποσια ὑπὸ τῶν πινόντων εἰσφερομένην*. Conviv. Soph. l. 8. [68. vol. III.] But *σύμβολον* signifies *tessera*, *signaculum;* and so other of the Fathers expounded it, and that most rightly; Symbolum tessera est et signaculum, quo inter fideles perfidosque secernitur. Max. Taurin. de trad. symb. [p. 239. Hept. præs.] Symbolum cordis signaculum, et nostræ militiæ sacramentum. Ambros. de veland. virg. l. 3. [4. 20.] This Petrus Chrysologus hath also respect to, when he saith, Accepturi ergo symbolum, hoc est pactum vitæ, salutis placitum, et inter vos et Deum fidei insolubile vinculum, pectora parate non chartam. Chrysol. Serm. 58. [Hept. Præs.]

[c] Post catechumenos secundus competentium gradus est. Competentes autem sunt qui jam post doctrinam fidei ad gratiam Christi percipiendam festinant. Ideoque appellantur competentes, i. e. gratiam Christi petentes. Nam catechumeni tantum audiunt nec dum petunt. Sunt enim quasi hospites et vicini fidelium de foris audiunt mysteria, audiunt gratiam, sed adhuc non appellantur fideles. Competentes autem jam petunt, jam accipiunt, jam catechizantur, id est imbuuntur instructione sacramentorum: istis enim quasi salutare symbolum traditur, quasi communicatorium fidei, et sanctæ confessionis indicium, quo instructi agnoscant quales jam ad gratiam Christi exhibere se debent. Isidor. Hispal. Eccles. offic. l. 2. c. [21.]

Now of all the creeds that were ever made, those that have been of the most esteem and greatest authority in the church of Christ are the Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and the creed which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed; of which three creeds this article treats, and asserts them to be all agreeable to the word of God, and may be proved from it. And each of these creeds, by the assistance of the Holy Trinity they speak of, I shall endeavour to give some light unto. And I think I need not do any thing more to prove them agreeable to the word of God, than to discover what they are; for he that doth but know that cannot but acknowledge the other. Of every one of them therefore in their order.

And first of the Nice or Nicene Creed: which that we may rightly understand, we must know that in the fourth century after our Saviour's incarnation, in the year of our Lord 325, there arising a contention in the church concerning the keeping of Easter, as also concerning the divinity of Christ, which Arius the heretic did most blasphemously oppose; other means failing, it pleased the most high God to put it into the heart of that pious and renowned emperor Constantine the Great, for the composing the contention about Easter, and the suppressing the heresy of Arius, by letters to call together all the bishops of the Christian world to meet at Nice, a city of Bithynia; which was the first general, and therefore the most famous council that ever was celebrated since the apostles' time; for the emperor's letters were no sooner divulged, but the bishops and ministers of the church of Christ from [d]all places of the world do with joy[e] and triumph meet together in the place appointed, to the number of 318.

Being met, amongst other things they consulted about the settling of one rule of faith over the whole world. For though they all (some heretics excepted) agreed in the fundamentals of religion, and in the substance of the Creed, believing in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet coming from such remote places from one another, they differed in the explications thereof, some having received fewer or more explications into their creeds than others; and as many as thought fit presented the creeds themselves were baptized into to the consideration of the council, to be settled and confirmed by it. Amongst the rest Pamphilus Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea Palestina, presents his; which was this:

---

[d] *Τῶν γοῦν ἐκκλησιῶν ἁπασῶν αἱ τὴν Εὐρώπην ἅπασαν Λιβύην τε καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐπλήρουν ὁμοῦ συνῆκτο τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργῶν τὰ ἀκροθίνια.* Euseb. de vita Constant. l. 3. c. 7. Hence Athanasius, speaking of the Christian faith, saith, *Ἣν ὁ μὲν Χριστὸς ἐχαρίσατο, οἱ δὲ ἀπόστολοι ἐκήρυξαν, καὶ οἱ πατέρες παραδεδώκασιν οἱ ἐν τῇ Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντες ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς οἰκουμένης.* Athanas. Epist. ad episcop. Afric. [p. 891. vol. I.]

[e] *Ὡς οὖν ἐφοίτα πανταχοῦ τὸ παράγγελμα οἷά τινος ἀπὸ νύσσης οἱ πάντες ἔθεον σὺν προθυμίᾳ πάσῃ.* Euseb. de vita Const. l. 3. c. 6.

"We believe[f] in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things, visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only-begotten Son, the first begotten of every creature, before all worlds begotten of God the Father, by whom also all things were made; who for our salvation was incarnate, and conversed amongst men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again to judge both the quick and dead: and we believe in one Holy Ghost: and every one of these to be and exist, the Father truly a Father, the Son truly a Son, the Holy Ghost truly an Holy Ghost."

This creed Eusebius presented to the council with this preamble; "The faith expounded[g] by us, and as we have received from the bishops that were before us in our first catechising, and when we received baptism, as we have learned from the holy scriptures, as we believed and taught in our presbytery, yea, and in our episcopacy too, and believing the same now, we make known our faith unto you. And this is it, *We believe in one God*, &c." From whence we may see that this creed or symbol, and so every part of it, was anciently received in the church before, and therefore that the Nicene council was not the first that called [Christ] "God of God," and "[h] Light of Light."

---

[f] *Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶντε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς γεγενημένον· δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα· τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τὸν Πατέρα καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον· τούτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πιστεύοντες, Πατέρα ἀληθῶς πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν ἀληθῶς υἱὸν, καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἀληθῶς ἅγιον πνεῦμα.* Socrat. Hist. eccles. l. I. c. [8.] Theodorit also records it too with no variation but only *ἐν δόξῃ* between *πάλιν* and *κρῖνα*, and for *ἀληθῶς*, *ἀληθινῶς*. Theodorit. Hist. l. I. c. II. [p. 553. vol. III.]

[g] *Ἡ ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐκτεθεῖσα πίστις καὶ καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ κατηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε καὶ τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν, καθὼς ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μεμαθήκαμεν, καὶ ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπιστεύομέν τε καὶ ἐδιδάσκομεν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν πιστεύοντες τὴν ἡμετέραν πίστιν προσαναφέρομεν· ἔστι δὲ αὕτη· πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν,* &c. Ibid.

Eusebius having presented this creed to the council, the emperor,[i] being present, was much pleased with it, and assented to it, and required the same from the council too. And therefore they made it the groundwork of the creed they intended to confirm. But besides some other alterations that they made in it not so considerable, seeing one end of their meeting was to suppress the Arian heresy that denied the divinity of Christ, they therefore inserted into the creed that the Son was homoousios, or of the same substance with the Father; (which was not a word new coined by themselves, but had been used in the like case by the Fathers long before that time :) and so they made up their creed after this manner :

---

[h] Nay and longer, before Eusebius too, Justin Martyr calls the Son φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ὁ μὲν γὰρ (Υἱὸς) φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς γεννητῶς ἐξέλαμψε. Justin. Expos. fid. de rect. confess. [9.]

[i] Ἀλλ' αὐτός τε πρῶτος ὁ θεοφιλέστατος ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς ὀρθότατα περιέχειν αὐτὴν ἐμαρτύρησεν, οὕτω τε καὶ ἑαυτὸν φρονεῖν συνωμολόγησε· καὶ ταύτῃ τοὺς πάντας συγκατατίθεσθαι, ὑπογράφειν τε τοῖς δόγμασι καὶ συμφρονεῖν τούτοις αὐτοῖς παρεκελεύετο. Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. [Ibid. p. 554.]

[j] Ἐπὶ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν τινὰς λογίους καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ συγγραφέας ἔγνωμεν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ θεολογίας τῷ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου συγχρησαμένους ὀνόματι. Euseb. apud Socrat. Hist. eccles. l. 1. c. [8.] et Theodor. Hist. l. 1. c. [11.] Οἱ δὲ ἐπίσκοποι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς εὑρόντες τὰς λέξεις ἀλλ' ἐκ πατέρων ἔχοντες τὴν μαρτυρίαν οὕτως ἔγραψαν· ἐπίσκοποι γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι πρὸ ἐτῶν ἐγγὺς ἕκατον τριάκοντα τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως γράφοντες ᾐτιάσαντο τοὺς ποίημα λέγοντας τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ μὴ ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί. Athanas. Epist. ad episc. Afric. [6. p. 896. vol. I.] And then presently he saith, that Eusebius himself acknowledgeth as much, citing the words of Eusebius we quoted before him, only reading θεότητος instead of θεολογίας. And one of those whom they intend, that lived 130 years before them, I suppose was Tertullian, who lived near 130 years before this council; for the council was not till an. 325, and he lived an. 200, and asserted the Son to be Filium Dei et Deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ. Apol. adv. Gentes. And certainly *unius substantiæ* is the same in Latin that ὁμοούσιος is in Greek.

The Nicene Creed.

"We believe[k] in one God the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things, visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father; God of God; Light of Light; very God of very God; begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both that are in heaven and that are upon earth: who for us men and for our salvation descended, was made flesh, and became man: he suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended into heaven, and will come again to judge both the quick and the dead: and in the Holy Ghost."

After the creed they immediately added an anathema, which ran thus: [l] "But such as say there was a time when he was not, and before he was begotten he was not, and that he was made of nothing: or such as say the Son of God is of another substance or essence, or convertible, or changeable, such the catholic and apostolic church pronounceth accursed."

This creed, with the anathema annexed to it, the whole council approved and subscribed to, even all the 318[m] persons in it, only five of the Arian heretics that excepted against the word *consubstantial.* And so we see this creed, when first confirmed by this council, went no further than *the Holy Ghost.* But six and fifty years after, viz. anno Dom. 381, Theodosius the emperor[n], for the further confirmation of the Nicene faith, the ordination of a bishop of Constantinople, and for the suppression of the Macedonian heresy that was then broached, denying the divinity of the Holy Ghost; I say, for these reasons, the emperor caused another general council to be held at Constantinople, where they being met did unanimously confirm the Nicene Creed, but with several other explications inserted into it. For besides other things, whereas the Nicene Creed ended at these words, "And in the Holy Ghost," the creed confirmed by this council runs thus, "And in the Holy Ghost[o], the Lord and Giver of life, proceeding from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets: and in one catholic and apostolic church: we acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins: we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life everlasting."

---

[k] *Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶντε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς τὸν ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός· Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τάτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον.* Symb. Nicæn. apud Athanas. Epist. ad Jovian. de fide [3.] Socrat. Hist. l. 1. c. [8.] Theodoret. l. 1. c. [11.] Cassiodor. Tripartit. hist. l. [2.] c. [9.] But in that copy of this creed which St. Basil [p. 89. vol. III.] sent in his epistle to the church of Antiochia, *Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ* and *παθόντα* are wanting, and after *κατελθόντα* there is *ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν* put in. Whether these alterations were from the scribe or printer, or from any other cause, I cannot tell. Certainly *παθόντα* is a necessary word, without which the sense doth not well cohere. And all of them, besides Athanasius, for *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* have *ἐν τῇ γῇ.*

[l] *Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο· ἦ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἦ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἦ τρεπτὸν, ἦ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.* Ibid. [p. 90.] Only Athanasius hath *ἦ κτιστὸν* before *ἦ τρεπτὸν,* which the other have not.

[m] *Ταύτην τὴν πίστιν τριακόσιοι πρὸς τοῖς δεκαοκτὼ ἔγνωσάν τε καὶ ἔστερξαν· καὶ ὡς φησὶν ὁ Εὐσέβιος ὁμοφωνήσαντες καὶ ὁμοδοξήσαντες ἔγραφον· πέντε δὲ μόνοι οὐ προσεδέ-*

With these additions at the end, and other explications (which we shall see presently) inserted into the body of it, did the Constantinopolitan council confirm the Nicene Creed; not as if this council first put these explications into it; for before this council sat, Cyril of Hierusalem, as one well observes, in his explication of the Creed, doth not end where the Nicene doth, at *the Holy Ghost*, but as the Creed confirmed by this council doth, even at[p] eternal life. And we

---

ξαντο τῆς λέξεως τοῦ ὁμοουσίου ἐπιλαβόμενοι. Εὐσέβιός τε ὁ τῆς Νικομηδείας ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ Θεόγνις Νικαίας, Μάρις Χαλκηδόνος, Θεωνᾶς Μαρμαρικῆς, Σεκοῦνδος Πτολεμάϊδος. Socrat. Hist. l. 1. c. [8.] vid. et Theodoret. Hist. eccles l. 1. c. [11.]

[n] Ἐν τάχει δὲ καὶ σύνοδον ἐπισκόπων ὁμοδόξων αὐτῷ συνεκάλεσε, βεβαιότητός τε ἕνεκεν τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ δοξάντων, καὶ χειροτονίας τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐπισκοπεῖν τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, ὑπολαβών τε δύνασθαι συνάψαι τῇ καθόλου ἐκκλησίᾳ τοὺς καλουμένους Μακεδονιανούς. Sozom. Hist. l. 7. c. 7. et Socrat. l. 5. c. 8.

[o] Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συνπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν· εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. [vid. Epiph. Anchor. cxx.]

[p] This we may easily see from

find Epiphanius also, who wrote his Anchorate six or seven years before this council, hath in that set down this creed with the same insertions into it wherewith the Constantinopolitan council did afterwards confirm it, and saith, it is the faith[q] delivered by the apostles and the 318 bishops in the Nicene council. Which gives me ground to think, that though the Nicene council did at the first confirm the Creed with no more in it than we have set down, yet that afterwards they did conclude upon other explications of it, which might be inserted into it. And that which confirms me the more in it is, because I find [r] Athanasius himself saying, that the writings or acts of the Nicene synod assert, that "the Son is of the same substance with the Father," and that "the Holy Ghost is to be glorified together with the Father and the Son;" which words are part of the additions that were in the Nicene Creed when the Constantinopolitan council confirmed it. Which makes me think, that were not the Acts of that synod (which he and Gregorius Cæsariensis[s] speak of) lost, we might find most, if not all of the other additions concluded upon then, but not inserted into the Creed, because that there was enough already contained in it to oppose all the heresies that were then abetted.

But howsoever, whether the Nicene Fathers concluded upon

Cyril himself, who, having expounded the Creed, adds, Ταῦθ' ἡμῖν τέως καὶ περὶ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς εἴρηται συμμέτρως, ἥτις ἔστι τῶν ἐπαγγελλομένων ἐν τῇ πίστει τὸ τελευταῖον δίδαγμα καὶ τέλος. Cyril. Hier. Catech. 18. [13.] So that even at that time when he expounded the Creed, which was above twenty years before the Constantinopolitan council, yet even then, I say, did the Creed end as it did afterwards.

[q] Αὕτη μὲν ἡ πίστις παρεδόθη ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει ἀπὸ πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν ἁγίων ἐπισκόπων ὑπὲρ τριακοσίων δέκα τὸν ἀριθμόν. Epiph. in Anchorat. [cxx.]

[r] Ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ τὸ τῆς μεγάλης συνόδου τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ γράμμα βούλεται ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱόν· καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ συνδοξάζεσθαι. Athanas. Epist. ad fratres orthodoxos. [p. 30. vol. II.] And elsewhere, speaking of the Nicene council, he saith, Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀπηλλοτρίωσαν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον συνεδόξασαν αὐτὸ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος πίστει. Id. Epist. ad Jovinian. [4.]

[s] Τὴν τοῦ θείου ὄντως συμβόλου πάσῃ αἱρετικῇ κακονοίᾳ τὴν παρείσδυσιν ἀποκλείοντες συνυφαίνουσιν ἔκθεσιν, δι' ἑκάστου ῥητοῦ, τὸ παρ' ἑκάστης αἱρέσεως ἀντικείμενον, καταργήσαντες φρόνημα· ὡς πᾶσιν εὔδηλον ἐκ τῆς ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ τῶν πραχθέντων τῇ συνόδῳ ἐξηγήσεως. Greg. Cæsar. de 318 patribus Nicen. orat. apud metaphr. Jul. 10. [p. 557.]

these explications whilst sitting in council, or whether any of them when the council was dismissed inserted them into the Creed out of what had been spoken and confirmed before in the synod, or whether some others did afterwards gather these several explications together out of other creeds and put them into this; I say, which way soever of these it was that these insertions came into the Creed, be sure the Constantinopolitan[t] was the first general council that confirmed the Creed with them in it, and upon that account may well be asserted to have added these explications to it; there being no other œcumenical council, or indeed any other council at all before that, that approved and confirmed the Creed with these explications inserted into it. For though the Nicene council itself should be thought to have approved and confirmed the truth of every explication with their authority, yet it is manifest they did not insert them into their Creed, so many several persons, some whereof were present there, having recorded the Creed as established by that council without any one of these explications in it. And there being no other general council betwixt the Nicene and Constantinopolitan, nor any council at all that we read of which confirmed that Creed with these explications in it before the Constantinopolitan; and seeing the Constantinopolitan did take these several explications, and add them to that Creed which was before confirmed by the Nicene council without them; their insertion into the Creed may upon good grounds be principally ascribed to that council. And though before this council the Nicene Creed did mostly run as we have before described, yet after this council it always ran thus:

---

[t] Constantinopoli synodus celebrata Niceno addidit concilio, quod manifestum est per fidei editionem synodi utriusque. Etenim trecentorum decem et octo Patrum editio nec ea quæ dicta sunt nuper habet, nec quod Spiritus Dominus sit et Deus aut vivificans, aut quod ex Patre procedat cumque illo adoretur, et conglorificetur, quoniam quæ Constantinopoli peracta est synodus hoc addidit. Hugo Eterian. de hæres. [Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. xxii.] l. 3. c. 16. *Τὴν ὀρθοδόξαν πίστιν ἐκράτυναν (οἱ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως πατέρες) καὶ Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκήρυξαν· προσθέντες τῷ προεκτεθέντι ἐν Νικαίᾳ τῆς πίστεως συμβόλῳ καὶ ταῦτα. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,* &c. Phot. Tyr. in concil. Synopsi. Nay, and the fourth general council itself at Chalcedon acknowledged that these explications into the Nicene Creed were put in by the 150 Fathers in the Constantinopolitan council, but adding, *οὐχ ὥς τι λεῖπον τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν ἐπεισάγοντες ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος αὐτῶν ἔννοιαν, κατὰ τῶν τὴν αὐτοῦ δεσποτείαν ἀθετεῖν πειρωμένων γραφικαῖς μαρτυρίαις τρανώσαντες.* Evagr. Hist. eccles. l. 2. c. 4. v. et Paulin. Aquil. in synod. Forojul. [Concil. vol. IV.] et Marc. Ephes. in synod. Ferrar. [Ibid. vol. IX.]

The Nicene Creed enlarged by the council of Constantinople.

"We believe[u] in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate: he suffered, and was buried, and the third day he rose again, according to the scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and dead, whose kingdom shall have no end. And (we believe) in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And (we believe) one catholic and apostolic Church; we acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; and we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."

---

[u] Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, τουτέστιν, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι᾽ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συνπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν· εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Symbol. Constantinop. v. Epiphan. in Anchor. [vol. II. p. 122.]

This Creed thus confirmed now by the second, as it had been before by the first general council, it is presently dispersed and carried about from Constantinople to most Christian churches in the world. Being brought as to others, so in particular to the Western churches, it was presently put (it is thought first by pope [x] Damasus) into their liturgies, even in the same manner as we have now set it down. But there arising afterwards a controversy amongst them, whether the Spirit proceeded from the Father only, or from the Father and Son both, the Eastern churches generally held, that he proceeded from the Father only, not from the Son, the Western, that he proceedeth both from the Father and the Son. Upon which they had [y] several disputes about it; but at length the Western or Latin church caused it to be inserted into their Creed. For whereas the Constantinopolitan council had said no more than "who proceedeth from the Father," they made it, "who proceedeth from the Father and the Son:" which being done without the consent of the Greek or Eastern church, proved one of the causes of the vast schism betwixt the Eastern and Western churches; which though it was often attempted, yet it could never be throughly made up, until the very taking of Constantinople by the Turks, an. Dom. 1453, nor indeed is it to this day perfectly composed.

---

[x] Mandavit ipse (Damasus) ut in principio celebrationis quam missam vocant confessio diceretur ut hodie fit. Platina in Damas. [p. 43.]

[y] One dispute they had about it at Gentilly. So Ado Viennen. Facta est tunc temporis synodus Gentiliacensis, anno incarnationis 767, et quæstio ventilata inter Græcos et Romanos de Trinitate, et utrum Spiritus sicut procedit a Patre ita procedat a Filio. Ado in Chronic. [Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. XVI. p. 805.] v. et Reg. Abat. Prum. l. [2. vol. 1.] ad eund. annum. Another contest about it they had at Aken: Synodus magna *Grani aquis* congregatur anno incarnat. Domini 809. in qua synodo de processione Spiritus S. quæstio agitatur, utrum sicut procedit a Patre ita procedat a Filio. Hanc quæstionem Johannes Monachus Hierosolymitanus moverat. Ibid. [p. 808.] Imperator Arduenna Aquisgranum reversus mense Octobri concilium habuit de processione Spiritus Sancti. Quam quæstionem Johannes quidam monachus Hierosolymis primo concitavit. Cujus definiendæ causa, Bernarius episcopus Wormatiensis, atque Jesse episcopus, et Adelhardus abbas monasterii Corbeiæ Romam ad Leonem Papam, missi sunt. Annal. Franc. an 809. [apud Hist. Franc. Script. stud. Du Chesne, vol. II. p. 255.] et Baron. ad eund. an. [vol. IX. p. 551.] V. et Monach. Egolism. in vita Caroli magni. What entertainment they had at Rome from pope Leo we may see artic. V. init.

The Spanish and French churches were the [z]first that inserted this into their Creed, and not long after them the English too; and so hath the Creed continued ever since in our public liturgies with this truth inserted into it; and so it remaineth to this day; as any one may see that pleaseth to cast his eyes upon this Creed as it stands in the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper.

And this I suppose is the Creed intended in this article, called by the name of the Nice, or Nicene Creed; because though there be several explications in it that were not inserted by the Nicene council, yet there was nothing inserted by the Nicene but what is expressly contained in this; neither is there any thing inserted into this but what is virtually contained in that. And the Nicene council, that first confirmed this Creed, being of greater authority and more renown than any others that afterwards enlarged it, it hath [a]therefore still retained the name (as well it might) of the Nicene Creed, not only amongst us, but [b]others too.

---

[z] The first church of all that we find to have put this clause into the Constantinopolitan Creed was the Spanish, who in the eighth council at Toledo an. 653. made the Creed run expressly, Credimus et in Spiritum S. vivificatorem ex Patre et Filio procedentem. Concil. Tolet. VIII. cap. I. [Concil. vol. III. p. 957.]

[a] Multis profecto fortissimis constat argumentis, duo illa priora symbola ab omnibus conciliis generalibus pro uno suscepta fuisse, præsertim a tertio, utpote quod prius cæteris conciliis utrumque vidit atque probavit. Et quamvis toto terrarum orbe simul ambo celebrarentur, de primo tamen symbolo tertium cæteraque concilia mentionem fecere, cum pro ipsius primi concilii auctoritate et existimatione quod majore Patrum numero celebratum fuit, quodque veluti cæterorum conciliorum fundamentum haberetur: tum etiam quod ipso Niceno symbolo Christianorum plures, quique denuo baptizabantur, frequentius uterentur. Marc. Eph. in syn. Ferrar. ses. V. [Conf. Concil. vol. IX. p. 55.]

[b] So Isidorus Hispalensis, speaking of this Creed, saith, Symbolum autem quod tempore sacrificii populo prædicatur, sanctorum Patrum trecentorum decem octo collatione apud synodum Nicænam est editum. De eccles. offic. l. I. c. [16.] Tria sunt symbola, primum apostolorum, secundum Patrum Nicænorum quod canitur in missa, tertium Athanasii; Alexand. de Ales, part. III. quæst. 69. [membr. V.] Illud est symbolum quod in missa cantatur editum in concilio Nicæno. Magist. Sentent. l. I. dist. II. Whereas it is the Constantinopolitan Creed that is always sung there. Indeed this Creed, with these insertions into it, Epiphanius himself calls the Nicene Creed, whose words we have quoted before. And so it is called to this day, not the Constantinopolitan, but the Nicene Creed, in all places where it is used.

Of this Creed it is here said, (as of the others,) that it ought throughly to be received and believed, and that it may be proved by sufficient warrant from scripture; which truly might easily be shewn, was it not proved in other places. But there is scarce any thing in it but what is expressed in other places in these Articles, and there shewn to be consonant, not only to the scriptures, but also to reason and the Fathers too: and therefore I shall not take it into pieces here, but only shew in general what esteem the Fathers of old had of this Creed.

And here I might first shew (but that I have spoken of it before) how there were above 300 Fathers at one time in the council of Nice, that then did unanimously subscribe unto it: amongst the whom Athanasius himself was one, who hath likewise left his own judgment in particular upon it, in his writings, saying, amongst other things, [c]"Let the things that were confessed by the Nicene council prevail; for they are right, and sufficient to overturn all the most wicked heresies, but especially the Arian, that blasphemeth the Word of God, and so necessarily speaketh evil of the Holy Ghost also." After this, the next general council confirmed the same faith too; for Sozomen tells us, that "afterwards [d]Nectarius and the other priests, meeting together in the Constantinopolitan council, determined that the faith of the council should remain firm, and that every heresy should be abolished." But this council, as I have shewn before, did not only confirm the Nicene Creed itself, but the other explications also of it that are inserted into it. And afterwards the next general council held at Ephesus confirmed what was done by both. For in this council, as Evagrius[e] saith, "the holy Creed of the council of Nice being read, and the determination also of the hundred and fifty Fathers, (at Constantinople,) they added, This wise and excellent symbol of the Divine grace is sufficient for the perfect knowledge and establishment of piety." Nay, and the fourth general council at Chalcedon subscribed to the same Creed too, as the same Evagrius relates. Whence the Fathers say in the Constantinopolitan council, ann. 518, "The holy Creed or symbol[f] in which we are all baptized, the synod met together by the Holy Spirit at Nice declared, the convent of the holy Fathers at Constantinople established, the holy synod at Ephesus strengthened, and the great and holy synod at Chalcedon also confirmed." The [g] same was also acknowledged by an ancient council here in England, ann. 673.

---

[c] Κρατείτω γὰρ τὰ ἐν Νικαίᾳ παρὰ πατέρων ὁμολογηθέντα· ὀρθὰ γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἱκανὰ πᾶσαν ἀσεβεστάτην αἵρεσιν ἀνατρέψαι, καὶ μάλιστα τὴν Ἀρειανὴν τὴν εἰς τὸν Λόγον Θεοῦ δυσφημοῦσαν καὶ ἐξ ἀνάγκης εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ Ἅγιον δυσσεβοῦσαν. Athanas. de divinit. Christi orat. ad Max. [vol. I. p. 920.] v. et Epist. ad episcopos Africanos.

[d] Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συνελθόντες αὐτός τε Νεκτάριος καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἱερεῖς ἐψηφίσαντο τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδου βεβαίαν μένειν τὴν πίστιν, καὶ πᾶσαν αἵρεσιν ἀποκεκηρύχθαι. Sozom. Hist. eccles. l. 7. c. 9. V. et Niceph. l. 12. c. 13. Socrat. l. 5. c. 8.

[e] Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναγνωσθέντος τοῦ ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἁγίου συμβόλου καὶ πρός γε τοῦ ὅρου τῶν ἕκατον πεντήκοντα ἁγίων πατέρων (ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει) ἐπήγαγον, ἤρκει μὲν οὖν

Indeed this Creed, thus established by the first general councils, hath been received by all Christian churches in the world; so that not only we European, but the African Christians also profess and acknowledge it: as we may see in that confession of faith made by Glaudius, king of Æthiopia, an. Dom. 1555, where he saith, [h] "But we walk in the royal,

---

εἰς ἐντελῆ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐπίγνωσίν τε καὶ βεβαίωσιν τὸ σοφὸν καὶ σωτήριον τοῦτο τῆς θείας χάριτος σύμβολον. Evagr. Hist. eccles. l. 2. c. 4. V. et c. 18. where we may see the Fathers of the fourth general council at Chalcedon confirming the same too. This Creed was also confirmed by the council at Sardica. v. Zonar. in concil. Constant. I. can. V. [apud Bever. Synodic. vol. I. p. 92.]

[f] Τὸ *ἅγιον σύμβολον ἐν ᾧ πάντες ἐβαπτίσθημεν ἐξεφώνησεν ἡ ἐν Νικαίᾳ σὺν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι σύνοδος, καὶ ἐκύρωσεν ἡ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων συνέλευσις, καὶ ἐβεβαίωσεν ἡ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἁγία σύνοδος, καὶ ἐπεσφράγισεν ὁμοίως ἡ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι μεγάλη ἁγία σύνοδος.* Act. V. concil. Constantinop. sub Menna. [Concil. vol. II. p. 1340.] v. et Concil. Emerit. can. 1. [vol. III. p. 999.]

[g] Suscepimus sanctas et universales quinque synodos beatorum et Deo acceptabilium Patrum, id est qui in Nicæa congregati fuerunt 318. contra Arrium impiissimum et ejusdem dogmata; et in Constantinopoli 150 contra vesaniam Macedonii et Eudoxii et eorum dogmata; et in Epheso primo 200 contra nequissimum Nestorium et ejusdem dogmata; et in Chalcedone 630. contra Eutychen et Nestorium et eorum dogmata; et iterum in Constantinopoli quinto congregati sunt concilio in tempore Justiniani junioris contra Theodorum et Theodoritum, et eorum dogmata contra Cyrillum. Concil. Anglican. apud Bed. hist. Angl. l. 4. c. 17.

[h] ንሕነሰ፡ ነሐውር፡ በፍኖተ፡ ንጉሠ፡ ጽዱሕ፡ አማናዊ፡ ወኢናጸንን፡ ኢለየማን፡ ወኢለፀጋም፡ እምትምህርተ፡ አበዊነ፡ ፲ ወ ፪ ሐዋርያት፡ ወጳውሎስ፡ ፈልፈለ፡ ጥበብ፡ ወ፸ወ፪ አርድእት፡

plain, and true way, and do not turn aside either to the right hand or to the left from the true doctrine of our Fathers, the twelve apostles, and of Paul the fountain of wisdom, and of the seventy-two disciples, and of the 318 orthodox (Fathers) that were gathered together at Nice, and of the 150 at Constantinople, and the 200 at Ephesus." So that if there be any, this doctrine contained in this Creed must needs be the catholic doctrine of the church of Christ.

And hence it is that Epiphanius, speaking of this Creed, saith, [i] "Do not ye cease, O faithful and orthodox men, to preserve this the holy faith of the catholic church, as the holy and only virgin of God (the church) hath received it from the holy apostles of the Lord, and so to bring your catechumens for the future to the holy baptism." With this agrees that of St. Basil; [k] "Both such as have been prepossessed with another confession of faith, and now are willing to be brought over to the unity of the orthodox, and such also as desire now to be instructed in the word of truth, it is necessary they should be taught the faith that was written by the holy Fathers in the council that was gathered together at Nice."

And hence it is also, that about an. Dom. 512, [l] "Timothy, patriarch of Constantinople, being desired by his friends, (as Theodorus Lector relates,) took care that the Nicene Creed should be read every time that the Lord's Supper was admin-

---

ወ፫፻፲ወ፰ ርቱዓን፡ ሃይማኖት፡ ዘተጋብኡ፡ በኒቅያ፡ ወ፻፡ ወ፶፡ በቍስጥንጥንያ፡ ወ፪፡ ፻ በኤፌሶን። Claud. reg. Æthiop. Confes. fidei.

[i] Μὴ διαλείπητε οἱ πιστοὶ καὶ ὀρθόδοξοι ταύτην τὴν ἁγίαν πίστιν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὡς παρέλαβεν ἡ ἁγία καὶ μόνη παρθένος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων τοῦ Κυρίου, φυλάττειν, καὶ οὕτως ἕκαστον τῶν κατηχουμένων τῶν μελλόντων τῷ ἁγίῳ λουτρῷ προσιέναι. Epiphan. in Anchorat. [119.]

[k] Τοὺς ἢ προληφθέντας ἑτέρᾳ πίστεως ὁμολογίᾳ καὶ μετατίθεσθαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὀρθῶν συνάφειαν βουλομένους, ἢ καὶ νῦν πρῶτον ἐν τῇ κατηχήσει τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπιθυμοῦντας γινέσθαι, διδάσκεσθαι χρὴ τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν μακαρίων πατέρων ἐν τῇ κατὰ Νίκαιαν ποτὲ συγκροτηθείσῃ συνόδῳ γραφεῖσαν πίστιν. Basil. Epist. 78. [vol. III.]

[l] Αἰτηθεὶς ἐκ τῶν σπουδαστῶν αὐτοῦ Τιμόθεος τὸ τῶν τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ πατέρων τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον καθ᾽ ἑκάστην σύναξιν λέγεσθαι παρεσκεύασεν, ἐπὶ διαβολῇ δῆθεν Μακεδονίου, ὡς αὐτοῦ μὴ δεχομένου τὸ σύμβολον, ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους λεγόμενον πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ παρασκευῇ τοῦ θείου πάθους τῷ καιρῷ τῶν γινομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου κατηχήσεων. Theod. Lect. collect. 2. [31, 32. vol. III. Scriptt. hist. eccl.]

ministered, for the reproof of Macedonius that did not receive this symbol; which before was read only once a year, upon the holy eve of the Lord's passion, at the time when the bishop catechised." And ever since that time hath that, and the other Greek churches in the East, as well as our Latin ones in the West, used still to read this Creed at the Communion or Lord's Supper; so that ours is not the first nor the only church that hath commanded it to be read at that time.

And what I have spoken of this Nicene Creed may be applied also to both the other, there being nothing in either of them but what is virtually if not expressly contained in this; so that they that receive this cannot deny them. And therefore, having spoken so much to this, I need speak but little concerning the other, besides the discovery of what those other creeds are, that this article saith ought to be received. And the next in order is Athanasius's Creed, so called from one Athanasius, once bishop of Alexandria, so famous for his opposing the Arian heresy in the time of the Nicene council, who was the supposed author of this Creed.

Athanasius's Creed.

[m] "Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith. Which faith except every

---

[m] Quicunque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat catholicam fidem; quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit absque dubio in æternum peribit. Fides autem catholica hæc est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate, et Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur, neque confundentes personas, neque substantiam separantes. Alia enim est persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti: sed Patris Filii et Spiritus S. una est divinitas, æqualis gloria, et coæterna majestas. Qualis Pater talis Filius, talis Spiritus Sanctus. Increatus Pater, increatus Filius, increatus Spiritus Sanctus; immensus Pater, immensus Filius, immensus Spiritus Sanctus. Æternus Pater, æternus Filius, æternus Spiritus S. Et tamen non tres æterni sed unus æternus: sicut nec tres increati, nec tres immensi, sed unus increatus, unus immensus. Similiter omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens Spiritus Sanctus; et tamen non tres omnipotentes sed unus omnipotens. Ita Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus Sanctus; et tamen non tres Dii, sed unus est Deus. Ita Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus Spiritus Sanctus; et tamen non tres Domini sed unus est Dominus. Quia sicut singillatim unamquamque personam Deum aut Dominum confiteri Christiana veritate compellimur, ita tres Deos aut Dominos dicere catholica religione prohibemur. Pater a nullo factus, nec creatus nec genitus est. Filius a Patre solo est, non factus, nec creatus, sed

one do keep wholly and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the catholic faith is this, That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one, the glory equal, the majesty coeternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, the Holy Ghost uncreate. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet they are not three eternals but one eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated, but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty; and yet they are not three Almighties but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet they are not three Gods but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Ghost is Lord; and yet they are not three Lords but one Lord. For like as we are

genitus. Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus est, sed procedens. Unus ergo Pater non tres Patres, unus Filius non tres Filii, unus Spiritus Sanctus non tres Spiritus Sancti. Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus, sed totæ tres personæ coæternæ sibi sunt et coæquales. Ita ut per omnia, sicut jam supra dictum est, et unitas in Trinitate et Trinitas in unitate veneranda sit. Qui vult ergo salvus esse ita de Trinitate sentiat. Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem ut incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat. Est ergo fides recta ut credamus et confiteamur quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus Dei Filius, Deus et homo est. Deus est ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus, homo ex substantia matris in sæculo natus; perfectus Deus, perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens. Æqualis Patri secundum divinitatem, minor Patre secundum humanitatem. Qui licet Deus sit et homo, non duo tamen sed unus est Christus. Unus autem non conversione divinitatis in carnem, sed assumptione humanitatis in Deum. Unus omnino non confusione substantiæ, sed unitate personæ. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita Deus et homo unus est Christus. Qui passus est pro salute nostra; descendit ad inferos: tertia die resurrexit a mortuis: ascendit ad cœlos; sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos; ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgent cum corporibus suis, et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem; et qui bona egerunt ibunt

compelled by Christian verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord; so are we forbidden by the catholic religion to say there be three Gods or three Lords. The Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So that there is one Father not three Fathers, one Son not three Sons, one Holy Ghost not three Holy Ghosts. And in this Trinity none is afore or after another, none is greater or less than another; but the whole three Persons are coeternal together and coequal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity. Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man; God of the substance of the Father begotten before the worlds; and man of the substance of his mother born in the world; perfect God and perfect man, of an human soul and flesh subsisting; equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, inferior to the Father as touching his manhood;

---

in vitam æternam, qui vero mala in ignem æternum. Hæc est fides catholica, quam nisi quis fideliter firmeque crediderit salvus esse non poterit. Symbol. Athan. [vol. II. p. 728.] This Creed I have here set down in Latin, because the Greek copies of it differ much from one another, but all agree with the Latin, but only in the article of the procession of the Spirit. For whereas it is here said, Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus est, sed procedens, I have one Greek copy hath it, *τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρός ἐστιν οὐ ποιητὸν, οὐ κτιστὸν, οὐ γεννητὸν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκπορευτόν*; another, *τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐ πεποιημένον, οὔτε δεδημιουργημένον, οὔτε γεγεννημένον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκπορευτόν*. So that as they both differ in Greek from one another, so from the Latin too in having no more than *ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς*, when the Latin hath A Patre et Filio. And the Greek copies thus differing from one another, and the Latin still remaining the same, it may give us some ground to think that it was first made in Latin, and the Greek copies variously translated from that. And this we find was the opinion of Gregory the Ninth's *ἀποκρισιάριοι*, or legates, that he sent to Constantinople, to reconcile the Greeks to the Latins, an. [1233.], viz. Haymo Rodolphus, Petrus and Hugo, who then said, Unde sanctus Athanasius dum in partibus occidentalibus exulabat, in expositione fidei quam Latinis verbis reddidit, sic ait, Pater a nullo est factus, &c. Abrah. Bzov. Eccles. annal. tom. XIII. ad an. [1233.]

who though he be God and man yet he is not two but one Christ; one not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance but by unity of Person: for as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ; who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven; he sitteth on the right of the Father God Almighty, from whence he shall come to judge both the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works: and they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire. This is the catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully he can never be saved."

This incomparable Creed, some think Anastasius[o], others Eusebius Vercellensis[p], others that some learned Frenchman[q] made it; but the most and the ancientest ascribe it to Athanasius. And truly though we cannot produce any certain argument from whence to prove it, yet this we know, there is nothing in it (especially in the Greek copies) but what is consonant to his other works; and that it hath been received in the church for above this four hundred[r], six hundred[s], yea, for above this eight hundred years together. For Hincmarus, that lived an. Dom. 850, commands his presbyters, [t]"That every one would commit to his memory the words of Athanasius concerning faith, the beginning whereof is, 'Whosoever will be saved,' and understand the sense of it, and so be able to pronounce it in common words."

---

[o] Licet plerique eum Anastasium esse falso arbitrantur. Johan. Beleth. Sum. divin. offic. c. [40.]

[p] Symbolum illud cui nomen *Quicunque vult*, ab Athanasio ut nonnulli arbitrantur conscriptum, ut alii ab Eusebio Vercellensi. Juel. adv. Harding. par. 2. c. 1.

[q] Magni Athanasii symbolum, quamvis Treveris, ut plerique tradiderunt, id est in Gallia, a theologo tamen inter illos doctissimo acutissimoque scriptum. Pithœus de Proces. Spirit. S. [p. 25.]

[r] Secundum symbolum *Quicunque vult salvus esse*, &c. ab Athanasio patriarcha in civitate Treveri compositum. Gul. Duranti episcopus Minacensis in Rational. divin. l. 4. c. 25.

[s] For so we find Abbo Floriacensis monasterii abbas, that lived an. Dom. 970, saying, Alii enim dicunt, ut arbitror secundum Athanasium, Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio non factus, nec creatus, sed procedens. Apol. ad Reg. Franc.

[t] Ut sermonem Athanasii de fide, cujus initium est, *Quicunque vult salvus esse*, memoriæ quisque commendet, et sensum illius intelligat, et verbis communibus enunciare queat. Hincmar. Archiep. Rhemens. in tom. III. Concil. a Sirmond. edit. in append. [p. 618.]

But howsoever, whether Athanasius be the author of it or no, be sure the Creed before rehearsed is the Creed that goes under his name, and by consequence that which we are to understand in this article by Athanasius's Creed, it going under that name as in others, so in our liturgy in particular. And it containing nothing but what is somewhere or other in these Articles proved from scripture, reason, and Fathers, the doctrine of it must needs be received as true, and consonant to the word of God.

The next is that which is commonly called "The Apostles' Creed," which, as every one knows, runs thus:

The Apostles' Creed.

"I believe in God[u] the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth: and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried: he descended into hell; the third day he rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty: from thence he shall come to judge both the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting. Amen.

Of this Creed it is here said that it is commonly called "the Apostles' Creed;" and so indeed it is; and that not only at this time and in this place, but it was so called by several of the Fathers themselves, who avouched the apostles themselves for its composers. For so saith St. Ambrose; "For the holy faith[x] is conceived in the Creed of the twelve apostles, who like wise workmen being met together, by their council they forged a key. For I may call the Creed itself a certain key, whereby the darkness of the Devil is opened, and the light of Christ comes in." And Ruffinus gives us it at large, saying, [y]"Our ancestors delivered by tradition or report, that after the ascension of the Lord, when by the coming of the Holy Spirit the fiery tongues sat upon all the apostles, that they could speak diverse and various languages, whereby no remote nation, no barbarous language, seemed inaccessible to them, and in the way there being a command given them from the Lord, that they should go and preach the word of God to every nation; being therefore to depart from one another, they appoint one rule of preaching in common amongst them, lest when taken from one another they might expound and deliver diverse things to them that were turned to the faith of Christ. Being therefore all together, and filled with the Holy Ghost, they drew up this short form of their future preaching, as we said, every one giving in what himself thought; and then they appoint that this should be given as the rule of faith to all believers. And this they would have called the Symbol for many and just causes." And what Ruffinus here delivers is delivered also by [z]Isidorus Hispalensis, [a]Venantius Honorius Clementianus, yea, and in the

---

[u] Πιστεύω εἰς τὸν Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν· τὸν συλληφθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, γεννηθέντα ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, παθόντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, σταυρωθέντα, θανόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, κατελθόντα εἰς ᾅδου, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς παντοδυνάμου, ἐκεῖθεν ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Πιστεύω εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἁγίων κοινωνίαν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκὸς ἀνάστασαν, ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Ἀμήν. Symb. Apostol.

---

[x] Duodecim enim apostolorum symbolo fides sancta concepta est, qui velut periti artifices in unum convenientes clavem suo consilio conflaverunt. Clavem enim quandam ipsum symbolum dixerim per quod reserantur diaboli tenebræ ut lux Christi adveniat. Ambros. de jejunio Eliæ. [p. 546. vol. I. ed. fol. *Par.* 1614.]

[y] Tradunt majores nostri quod post ascensionem Domini, cum per adventum Sancti Spiritus super singulos quosque apostolos igneæ linguæ sedissent, ut loquelis diversis variisque loquerentur, per quod eis nulla gens extera, nullæ linguæ barbaræ inaccessæ viderentur, et in via præceptum eis a Domino datum ob prædicandum Dei verbum ad singulas quasque proficisci nationes; discessuri itaque ab invicem normam prædicationis in commune constituunt, ne forte alius ab alio abducti diversum aliquid his qui ad fidem Christi mutabantur exponerent. Omnes ergo in uno positi et Spiritu Sancto repleti breve illud futuræ sibi, ut diximus, prædicationis indicium, conferendo in unum quod sentiebat unusquisque, componunt, atque hanc credentibus dandam esse regulam statuunt. Symbolum autem hoc multis et justissimis ex causis appellare voluerunt. Ruffin. Exp. symb. [init.]

[z] Isidor. Hispal. Eccles. offic. l. 2. c. 23.

[a] Venant. Honor. præf. ad Expos. symb. apost. [Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. X. p. 592.]

181st sermon [b]De Tempore, ascribed to St. Austin: in all which, not only the same sense is expressed, but almost by the same words too, as if not only the same form of faith had been received by tradition, but also the same form of tradition had itself been received by tradition too.

Of this symbol it is also that Leo Magnus saith, [c]"The short and perfect confession of this catholic symbol, which is made up of the twelve sentences of so many apostles, is so furnished with heavenly munition, that they with their own sword are able to beat all the opinions of the heretics." And St. Hierome saith, [d]"That the symbol of our faith and hope which was delivered by the apostles is not written in paper or ink, but in the fleshly tables of the heart."

But in the sermons De Tempore there is set down also the particular articles that every one of the apostles put in. [e]"Peter said, I believe in God the Father Almighty; John said, The maker of heaven and earth; James said, I believe in Jesus Christ his only-begotten Son our Lord; Andrew said, Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; Philip said, He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; Thomas said, He descended into hell, the third day he rose again from the dead; Bartholomew said, He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; Matthew said,

---

[b] [Aliis editt. dict. Sermo de symbolo; vol. VI. App. p. 277. init.]

[c] Ipsius catholici (symboli) brevis et perfecta confessio, quæ duodecim apostolorum totidem est signata sententiis, tam instructa sit in munitione cælesti, ut omnes hæreticorum opiniones solo possint gladio detruncari. Leo Epist. [27. vol. I.] ad Pulcher.

[d] Symbolum fidei et spei nostræ quod ab apostolis traditum non scribitur in charta aut atramento, sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus. Hieron. epist. 61. ad Pammachium. [vol. II. p. 435.]

[e] Petrus dixit, Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem; Johannes dixit, Creatorem cœli et terræ; Jacobus dixit, Credo et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum; Andreas dixit, Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Virgine Maria; Philippus ait, Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus; Thomas ait, Descendit ad inferna, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; Bartholomæus dixit, Ascendit ad cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis; Matthæus dixit, Inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos; Jacobus Alphæi, Credo et in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam; Simon Zelotes, Sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum; Judas Jacobi, Carnis resurrectionem; Matthias complevit, Vitam æternam. Serm. de Tempore, [ccxli. vol. V. App.]

From thence he will come to judge both the quick and the dead; James, the son of Alphæus, I believe also in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic church; Simon Zelotes, The communion of saints, the remission of sins; Judas, the brother of James, The resurrection of the flesh; Matthias added, The life everlasting."

And thus we see how commonly this Creed was of old called the Apostles' Creed: every part whereof is somewhere or other in these Articles proved (as the other are) consonant both to scripture, reason, and Fathers. And therefore we conclude that *the three Creeds, Nice Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought throughly to be received and believed.*

ARTICLE IX.

OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH SIN.

Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek φρόνημα σαρκὸς, *which some do expound* the wisdom, *some* the sensuality, *some* the affection, *some* the desire of the flesh, *is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.*

THOUGH there be no such words as original sin to be found in the scripture, yet that there is such a thing as original sin to be found in our own hearts, we have all too woful experience of it. And therefore supposing the thing so sadly experienced by us all, here we have it described, and that both negatively and positively, both what it is not, and what it is. First, * it is here shewed what it is not, or wherein it doth not consist; viz. it doth not consist in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians[a] of old held. But, secondly and positively, it is here said to be both *the fault and corruption of man's nature:* it is the fault, and therefore we are guilty of it; it is the corruption also, and therefore we are defiled with it. Neither is it the fault and corruption of some, but[b] all; all that naturally, or according to the common course of nature, proceed from Adam; all have this fountain of sin in their hearts, and all issue forth the streams of sin in their lives; *whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil.* He was made full of righteousness, but that he lost; he was made empty of sin, but that he found: so that he is not only emptied of the righteousness he was before filled with, but also filled with the sin he was before empty of. So that he that before did not only not hate God but love him, now doth not only not love him but hate him; and he that before did not only not love sin but hate it, now doth not only not hate sin but love it; his nature being now averse from good and inclined to evil, as it was before averse to evil and inclined to good;

---

* *it here sheweth* MS.

---

[a] So called from one Pelagius, a Welshman, and therefore termed Pelagius Brito. So St. Augustine, Pelagium quem credimus (ut ab alio distingueretur qui Pelagius Tarenti dicitur) Britonem fuisse cognominatum. Aug. Epist. [186. vol. II.] ad Paulinum. This person lived an. Dom. 410. and was the broacher and abettor of many dangerous opinions. Amongst the rest, he held that we are not born sinners, and that Adam's sin was not imputed to us, nor did it hurt any one but himself. But in the Diospolitan synod in Palestina, for fear of the sentence that should have been passed upon him, he renounced that opinion, and acknowledged that Adam's sin was prejudicial to his posterity also, and anathematized all such as thought otherwise. But the synod being dissolved, though he would still seem to hold what he there acknowledged, even that Adam by his sin did his posterity hurt, as well as himself, yet then he explained more fully what he meant, viz. that he did hurt his posterity indeed by his sin, but not by propagation of his sin to them, but by giving them so bad an example; as if his sin was not propagated *to them, but they imitated his sin. Hence St. Austin; Quid enim ad rem de qua nunc agimus pertinet, quod discipulis suis respondet? Ideo se objecta damnasse, quia et ipse dicit non tantum primo homini, sed etiam humano generi primum illud obfuisse peccatum non propagine sed exemplo; id est, non quod ex illo traxerint aliquod vitium qui ex illo propagati sunt, sed quod eum primum peccantem imitati sunt omnes qui postea peccaverunt. Aug. contra Pelag. et Celest. de peccato originali. [l. ii. 16. vol. X.]

[b] *'Αναμάρτητος μὲν ἀνθρώπων οὐδεὶς πάρεξ τοῦ γινομένου δι' ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπου.* Clem. Constitut. 2. c. 18. [p. 226. vol. I.] *'Επείπερ οὐδεὶς ὡς τὰ λόγια φησὶ, καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου.* Dionys. Areop. Eccles. hier. c. 7. [p. 414. vol. I.] Vid. Art. xv.

* *by them* MS. *to them* ed. 1716.

so that the flesh lusteth contrary to the Spirit, and therefore in every person born into this world it deserveth wrath and damnation. For in that it is a fault, it must needs transgress God's precepts; and in that it transgresseth his precepts, it must needs incense his person, and so deserve wrath and damnation, and therefore damnation because wrath. For it is the wrath of God that is the damnation and torment of a soul in hell; as his love is the salvation and glory of a saint in heaven. *And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated.* So that though grace in this life may take away the strength, it cannot take away the life of sin. But though a saint may not live in sin, still sin will live in him. His strong sins may every day grow weaker and weaker, and his weak graces may every day grow stronger and stronger; but his weak graces will never be perfectly strengthened[c], nor his strong sins perfectly weakened, so long as he is in this life. So that though there shall be no condemnation to them hereafter, yet there are corruptions in them here; the apostle himself confessing lust and concupiscence to be a sin, which no saint but will himself confess to be in him. The sum of all which is this: Adam's sin is imputed to us, and we are infected with it, and that not only before, but after we are born again, even so long as in this life. All which I shall briefly prove from scripture, reason, and Fathers.

First, the scriptures do plainly shew that Adam's sin is our guilt as well as his, and that we did as really sin in him as we proceed from him. For so saith the apostle; *Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.* Rom. v. 12. Where we see the apostle saying, *All have sinned* before all were born, which could not be unless they had before sinned in him from whom they were born. And so many render the words, [d] *In whom all have sinned;* and therefore the same apostle tells us, *In Adam all died*, 1 Cor. xv. 22. Now how could all die in him, unless all sinned in him? For death is the wages of sin only, as well as the only wages of sin. And that we are not only guilty of this sin, but also defiled with it, the Psalmist is plain, saying, [e] *Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me*, Psalm li. 5. So that sin was in his heart whilst he was in his mother's womb; for seeing he was conceived in sin, sin must needs be conceived in him: and the apostle, that *we were by nature the children of wrath, even as others*, Eph. ii. 3; and how can we be the children of wrath, unless we be first the parents of sin? Certainly there can be no other way that we can be by nature subject to wrath, the wages of sin, but because we are by nature subject to those sins that deserve this wrath. And so our Saviour tells us, *that which is born of the flesh is flesh*, John iii. 6: that which is born of flesh corrupted with sin must needs be itself flesh corrupted with sin. And that this infection remains even after regeneration the apostle asserts in saying, *If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us*, 1 John i. 8. So that for any man to say he hath no sin, he commits sin in saying so, for in plain terms he lies. And therefore David saith, *Enter*

---

[c] Charitas in aliis major, in aliis minor, in aliis nulla est; plenissima, quæ jam non potest augeri, quamdiu hic homo vivit, est in nemine. August. Epist. [167. 15. vol. II.] ad Hieronym.

[d] In the Greek it is, Ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. Vulg. In quo omnes peccaverunt. Whence St. Austin, De illis quoque apostolicis verbis in quibus impudentia mirabili imo dementia resistitis fundatissimæ fidei,

ubi ait, *per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines pertransiit in quo omnes peccaverunt*, frustra sensum alium novum atque distortum et a vero abhorrentem moliris exculpere; affirmans ea locutione dictum esse *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, ac si diceretur propter quod omnes peccaverunt; sicut dictum est *in quo corrigit junior vitam suam;* ut viz. non in uno homine omnes homines peccasse intelligantur originaliter, &c. Non ergo huic sensui convenit illa locutio, ita dictum esse *in quo* velut dictum esset *propter quod.* Aug. contra Julian. Pelag. l. 6. [75. vol. X.] And the Ethiopic translation gives us the clear exposition of the words, *For as by the iniquity of one man sin entered into the world, and by that sin death came upon all men;* እስመ፡ ለዐለ፡ ኵሉ፡ ሰብእ፡ ተኈለቈት፡ ይእቲ፡ ኀጢ፡ ለተ። Because that sin is imputed to every man; so that this sin of Adam is imputed to us, and therefore it is that death came upon us.

[e] Suscepit personam generis humani David, et attendit omnium vincula, propaginem mortis consideravit, originem iniquitatis advertit, et ait, *ecce enim in iniquitatibus conceptus sum.* Nunquid David de adultero natus erat? De Jesse viro justo et conjuge ipsius. Quid est quod se dicit *in iniquitate conceptum*, nisi quia trahitur iniquitas ex Adam? Etiam ipsum vinculum mortis cum ipsa iniquitate concretum. Aug. in loc. [Ps. l. 7. p. 467. vol. IV.]

not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified, Psalm cxliii. 2. And certainly there is none perfectly freed from sin, when St. Paul himself saith, *Sin dwelleth in me*, Rom. vii. 17 : and, *I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members*, ver. 23. And hence it is that the lust of the flesh *is not subject to the law of God*, Rom. viii. 7 ; and this very *lust of the flesh*, or concupiscence, *is not of the Father, but of the world*, 1 John ii. 16 ; nay, and it is expressly forbidden in the tenth commandment, *Thou shalt not covet*, or lust, which the apostle takes notice of, saying, *I had not known lust, unless the law had said, Thou shalt not covet*, Rom. vii. 7. And therefore this lust being itself a [f] sin, and the saints themselves being subject to it, sin must needs remain in them even after they are converted from it.

And if we proceed to reason for its determination of these things, we may briefly argue thus: first, that Adam's sin is our guilt is plain, in that we were in his loins when he committed it. As Levi paid tithes in Abraham's loins to Melchisedeck, Heb. vii. 9, 10, so did we commit sin in Adam's loins against God. Though himself was a particular person, yet was the [g] whole human nature not only represented by him, but contained in him ; and therefore was he called not by any particular or proper name, but Adam, that is, man in general. And all mankind thus being in him, whatsoever he did all mankind could not but do with him. If he had stood, all mankind had stood with him; and so he falling, all mankind fell in him. And, secondly, that it is our corruption or infection as well as guilt is plain upon the same ground too. For as we being in him, he sinning we could not but sin in him; so he becoming a sinner, we could not but become sinners in him too: especially considering that this Adam begat Seth, and so all his posterity, in his own likeness, Gen. v. 3; and if in his own likeness, then [h] sinners like himself. As a wolf begets wolves, not lambs; so he a sinner begat sinners, not saints. If he had begotten his posterity when a saint, he had begotten saints; but begetting them when a sinner, he could not but beget sinners. And hence [i] a child is a sinner as soon as born, yea as soon as conceived, before it hath any sin committed by it, it hath sin conceived in it. And therefore it was that under the law children were commanded to be circumcised the eighth day, and under the Gospel to be baptized [k] whilst infants, to shew that even whilst infants they contracted a natural guilt by coming through their parents' loins, which cannot be washed away but by the blood of Christ. And lastly, that this infection remains, even when the person is born again, so long as in this life, is plain, in that otherwise heaven would be brought down to earth, and earth turned into heaven. For to have sin perfectly subdued under us, and grace perfectly confirmed in us, is certainly the crown of the crown of glory, the very heaven of heaven, which I cannot see how any one can in reason expect, so long as himself is upon earth. But I need not speak any more to this, which is so sadly experienced by all Christians. None that have any grace will say they have no sin; and he that saith he hath no sin, it is an argument to me that he hath no grace. He that doth not find sin warring against his graces, surely hath no grace to war against his sins. And so to heap up arguments to prove this, would be to spend time to prove that which nobody can deny, nay that which if any one doth deny it, his very denying it is a proof of it.

---

[f] And so some of the Fathers themselves called the lust of the flesh, or concupiscence, a sin. Bonus ergo rector malos equos restringit, et revocat, bonos incitat. Boni equi sunt quatuor, prudentia, temperantia, fortitudo, justitia: mali equi iracundia, concupiscentia, timor, iniquitas. Ambros. apud August. contra Julian. Pelag. l. 2. [12. vol. X.] To which St. Augustine himself saith, Catholice istos equos intelligimus vitia nostra quæ legi mentis ex lege peccati resistunt. Ibid. Istam vero legem peccati, cujus manentis reatus in sacro fonte remissus est, propterea vocavit iniquitatem, quia iniquum est ut caro concupiscat adversum spiritum. Ib. Ita concupiscentia adversus quam concupiscit spiritus et peccatum est. Ibid. [lib. 5. 8.]

[g] Adam et Eva natura humani generis erant, quare in illis unis omnes eramus. Aug. contra Pelagian. Hyp. l. 2. [p. 10. App. vol. X.] Adam factus est absque peccato natura ; cum vero peccavit homo natura peccavit, et facta est jam natura peccatrix. Ibid.

---

[h] Homo peccator genuit hominem sine dubio peccatorem: quia de natura vitiata non nisi natura nascitur vitiosa, id est peccatrix. Ibid.

[i] Quis mihi commemoret peccata infantiæ meæ? Quia nemo mundus a peccato coram te, nec infans cujus unius diei vita super terram. .... Quid ergo tunc peccabam? an quia uberius inhiabam plorans? .... An pro tempore etiam illa bona erant, flendo petere etiam quod noxie daretur, indignari acriter his a quibus genitus est, ... feriendo niti nocere quantum potest? .... Illa imbecillitas membrorum infantilium innocens est, non animus infantium. Aug. Confes. l. I. [11. vol. I.]

[k] Addi his etiam illud potest, ut requiratur quid causæ sit cum baptisma ecclesiæ in remissionem peccatorum detur, secundum ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari, cum utique si nihil esset in parvulis quod ad remissionem deberet et indulgentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur. Orig. in Lev. hom. 8. [3. vol. II.] Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum; quorum peccatorum? Vel quo tempore peccaverunt? Aut quomodo potest illa in parvulis lavacri ratio subsistere nisi juxta illum sensum de quo paulo ante diximus, *Nullus mundus a sorde nec si unius diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram?* Et quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur et parvuli. Id. in Luc. hom. 14. [vol. III.]

And this hath been the doctrine of the catholic church in all ages. St. Cyprian tells us[l], "There were before Christ also famous men, prophets and priests; but being conceived and born in sin, they wanted neither original nor personal guilt." And elsewhere, [m] "But if the forgiveness of sins is granted to the greatest offenders, and such as sinned very much against God, when they have believed, and no one is kept back from baptism and grace, how much more ought an infant not to be forbidden it, who being newly born hath committed no sin, but that it being after a carnal manner born of Adam, it hath contracted the contagion of the old death in its first nativity? Who cometh easier to receive remission of sins, in that not its own but another's sins are pardoned to it; that is, not the sins committed in its own person, but only that which was committed by Adam."

---

[l] Fuerant et ante Christum viri insignes, prophetæ, et sacerdotes. Sed in peccatis concepti et nati, nec originali nec personali caruere delicto. Cyprian. de jejunio et tentat. [p. 35.]

[m] Porro autem si etiam gravissimis delictoribus et in Deum multum ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur, et a baptismo atque gratia nemo prohibetur, quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit? Qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata. Id. Epist. ad Fidum. [p. 161.]

And Athanasius saith[n], "That as Adam sinning, the sin descended to all men; so the Lord conquering, that his conquest at last comes to us." And Origen[o], "Every one that cometh into this world is said to be affected with a certain pollution: and therefore the scripture saith, *There is none clean from filth, though he be but one day old.* Upon this very account therefore, because a man is placed in his mother's womb, and receiveth the materials of his body from his father's seed, he may therefore be said to be defiled both in his father and mother." And hence is that of St. Basil, [p]"Here is mercy without judgment, for he did not come to judge the world, but to save the world: but there will not be judgment without mercy, because there cannot be a man found that is clear from filth, though it be his birthday."

St. Ambrose expresseth it elegantly; [q] "Who is he that lends out sin but the devil? from whom Eve having borrowed sin, by the usury of obnoxious succession she lent it out again to all mankind."

But who can speak fuller to this purpose than St. Augustine, who hath written many books in the defence of this truth? And he, amongst many other things I might quote, saith expressly, [r]"For as infants do not imitate Christ, because they cannot, and yet may belong to his spiritual [grace]; so without the imitation of the first man, yet they are bound with the infection of being begotten carnally of him."

---

[n] *Ὥσπερ γὰρ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ παραβάντος εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡ ἀπάτη διέβη· οὕτω τοῦ Κυρίου ἰσχύσαντος ἡ τοιαύτη ἰσχὺς λοιπὸν εἰς ἡμᾶς διεβήσατο.* Athanas. contra Arrian. orat. [I. 51.]

[o] Omnis qui ingreditur hunc mundum in quadam contaminatione effici dicitur: Propter quod et scriptura dicit, *Nemo mundus a sorde, nec si unius diei fuerit vita ejus.* Hoc ipso ergo quod in vulva matris est positus, et quod materiam corporis ab origine paterni seminis sumit, in patre et matre contaminatus dici potest. Origen. in Lev. hom. 12. [4.]

[p] *Ἐνταῦθα μὲν οὖν ἔλεός ἐστι χωρὶς κρίσεως, οὐ γὰρ ἦλθε ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα σώσῃ τὸν κόσμον· ἐκεῖ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι κρίσις χωρὶς ἐλέους διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ἄνθρωπον καθαρὸν εὑρεθῆναι ἀπὸ ῥύπου μηδὲ ἐὰν μία ἡμέρα ᾖ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ.* Basil. in Psa. xxxii. [p. 174. vol. I.]

[q] Quis iste peccati est fœnerator nisi diabolus? A quo Eva mutuata peccatum obnoxiæ successionis usuris defœneravit omne genus humanum. Ambros. in Tob. c. 9.

[r] Nam sicut non imitantur Christum parvuli quia non possunt, et tamen ad ejus gratiam spiritualem pertinere possunt; ita sine imitatione primi hominis, contagione tamen ex ipso carnalis generationis obstricti sunt. Aug. contra Jul. Pelag. l. 6. [79. vol. X.] V. et de Peccat. merit. et remissione, l. 1. c. 9.

And that this infection remains also after baptism, the same Father is express: [t] "Let it not be thought that we should say that (lust or concupiscence) is sanctified, with which the regenerate themselves are forced to conflict, in a certain intestine war as with an enemy, and to desire and pray to be healed from that plague." And elsewhere, [u] "So long as thou livest here, sin will necessarily be in thy members; but howsoever, let the dominion of it be taken away, let it not be obeyed in what it commands." And again; [x] "Is all iniquity blotted out (in baptism)? Doth no infirmity remain? If no infirmity remain, we might live without sin. But who can say this, unless he be proud? unless unworthy of the mercy of the Redeemer? unless he will deceive himself, and be one in whom there is no truth?" And elsewhere; [y] "Though in that we are born of God we cannot commit sin; yet there is still that in us that we were born of Adam." I shall conclude this with that of Fulgentius[z]; "For the saints themselves see that though through grace they are free from the contagion of evil works, yet that they are held captive by the variety of thoughts. For who can glory that he hath a chaste heart? or who can glory that he is quite cleansed from sin? Let us consider who and how just a person it was that said, *In many things we offend all.*" And thus we see the Fathers too asserting that *original sin standeth not in the following of Adam*, &c.

---

[t] Absit ut dicamus sanctificari (concupiscentiam) cum qua necesse habent regenerati, si non in vacuum Dei gratiam susceperunt, intestino quodam bello tanquam cum hoste confligere, et ab ea peste desiderare atque optare sanari. Aug. contra Jul. Pelag. l. 6. [51.]

[u] Quamdiu vivis, peccatum necesse est esse in membris tuis; saltem illi regnum auferatur, non fiat quod jubet. Id. in Joh. Tract. 41. [12. vol. III. par. ii.]

[x] Nunquid quia deleta est tota iniquitas? Nulla remansit infirmitas? Si non remansisset, sine peccato hic viveremus. Quis autem audeat hoc dicere, nisi superbus? Nisi misericordia liberatoris indignus? Nisi qui seipsum vult decipere? et in quo veritas non est? Ibid. [10.]

[y] Quamvis enim in quantum ex Deo nati sumus non peccemus, inest tamen adhuc etiam quod ex Adam nati sumus. Id. contra Epist. Parmen. l. 2. [14. vol. IX.]

[z] Vident enim (animæ justificatorum) quia licet sint gratiæ dono ab operum malorum contagione liberæ, teneantur tamen cogitationum varietate captivæ. Quis enim gloriabitur castum se habere cor? Quis gloriabitur mundum se esse a peccatis? Attendamus qualis quantusque justus dixerit, *In multis etiam offendimus omnes.* Fulgent. Epist. 3. [34.] ad Probam de virginit. et humilit.

ARTICLE X.

OF FREEWILL.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable unto God, without the grace of Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

WHEN man fell from God, great was his fall indeed; for he fell from the Creator to the creature; he fell from heaven to earth; he fell from the height of happiness to the depth of misery, for he fell from holiness into sin. And ever since man first fell from holiness to sin, he hath been unable to rise again from sin to holiness. Ever since he first chose the evil before the good, he hath been unable to choose the good before the evil. I know that as he was [a]created at the first with freedom of will, he had power so to choose the good as to refuse the evil, and so to refuse the evil as to choose the good. And I know also, that when he fell from God he did[b] not quite lose that freedom of his will, for he is still a reasonable creature, and[c] wheresoever there is reason in the understanding there is freedom in the will. But I know withal, that this freedom of will is much corrupted and degenerated now since the fall, from what it was before the fall. Then it was free to choose the good as well as the evil; now it is free to choose the evil but not the good: then it was free from sin to holiness; now it is free from holiness to sin: then it could so refuse the evil as to choose the good, and so choose the good as to refuse the evil; but now it can only so refuse the good as to choose the evil, and so choose the evil as to refuse the good. So that though the fall did not destroy it, yet it corrupted it; though the will be still [d]free, yet not to God, not to grace, not to piety, but only to the world, to sin, and to iniquity. And therefore it is, that as man willingly fell into sin at first, so he willingly lies in it still; and the only reason why he doth not rise again to holiness is, [e]because he will not: nay, he so will not, that of himself he cannot will it. For his will being itself corrupted, it cannot but choose and delight in corruption; and so it must necessarily refuse what is good and honest: which necessity doth

---

[a] *Καὶ ὅτι αὐτεξουσίους ἡμᾶς εἰργάσατο ὁ τῶν ἁπάντων δημιουργὸς, καὶ πανταχοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γνώμης τῆς ἡμετέρας ἢ κατακρίνει ἢ στεφανοῖ.* Chrysost. in Gen. hom. 20. [init. vol. I.] *Διά τοι τοῦτο καὶ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἡμῖν δεδώρηται καὶ ἐν τῇ φύσει καὶ ἐν τῷ σενειδότι ἡμῶν ἐναπέθετο τὴν γνῶσιν τῆς κακίας καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς.* Ibid. hom. 23. [p. 171.] *Τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους αὐτεξουσίοὺς λέγω ὑπὸ Θεοῦ γεγενῆσθαι ἀλλ' οὐ παντεξουσίους.* Orig. dial. 3. contra Marcion. [p. 838. vol. I.] Et ne quid deesset bonis ejus etiam liberum arbitrium ei indulsit, ut bonum ejus esset voluntarium non coactum. Bern. de pug. spir. 1. [p. 544.]

[b] Quis autem nostrum dicat quod primi hominis peccato perierit libe-

---

rum arbitrium de humano genere? Libertas quidem periit per peccatum, sed illa quæ in paradiso fuit habendi cum plena immortalitate justitiam, propter quod natura humana divina indiget gratia, dicente Domino, *si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc vere liberi eritis,* utique liberi ad bene justeque agendum. Nam liberum arbitrium usque adeo in peccatore non periit, ut per illud peccent maxime omnes qui cum delectatione peccant et amore peccati; hoc eis placet quod eis libet: Unde et apostolus, *cum essetis,* inquit, *servi peccati,* &c. Aug. contra duas epist. Pelag. l. 1. [5. vol. X.]

[c] Libertas arbitrii cunctis pariter ratione utentibus convenit. Bernard. de grat. et lib. arbitrio. [p. 1184.] *Φάμεν τοίνυν εὐθέως τῷ λογικῷ συνεισέρχεσθαι τὸ αὐτεξούσιον.* Damasc. de orthodox. fid. l. 2. c. 27. *Εἰ δὲ τοῦτο ἐξ ἀνάγκης παρυφίσταται τῷ λογικῷ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον· ἢ γὰρ οὐκ ἔσται λογικὸν, ἢ λογικὸν ὂν κύριον ἔσται πράξεων· καὶ αὐτεξούσιον, ὅθεν καὶ τὰ ἄλογα οὐκ εἰσὶν αὐτεξούσια· ἄγονται γὰρ μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως ἤπερ ἄγουσι.* Ibid.

[d] Ex quo enim primus homo naturam suam voluntarie vitiavit, atque oppressit infirmitas, nisi divinæ gratiæ medicamento præventum in unoquoque homine sanetur atque adjuvetur liberum indesinentur arbitrium. Est quidem liberum non tamen bonum; est liberum non tamen sanum; est liberum non tamen justum. Et quanto magis a bonitate, rectitudine, sanitate, justitiaque liberum, tanto magis malitiæ, perversitatis, infirmitatis atque iniquitatis mortifera servitute captivum. Fulgent. de incarn. et grat. Christi, [38.] V. et Cassiodor. in Psal. cxvii.

[e] Nam quod surgere anima per se jam non potest quæ per se cadere potuit, voluntas in causa est, quæ corrupti corporis vitiato et vitioso amore languescens, et jacens, amorem pariter justitiæ non admittit. Bernard. super Cantica, serm. 81.

not excuse the will, as the will doth not exclude the necessity; for indeed it is a willing necessity. As the angels necessarily love God, and yet they love him willingly; so man willingly loves sin, and yet he loves it necessarily, not from any external but an internal necessity, not forced by others, but allured by himself; his own will being so taken with sin that he cannot but take delight in it, and so averse from holiness that he cannot turn to it.

And this is that which is here said, *The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God;* he cannot repent, he cannot believe, he cannot turn to God, nay, he cannot so much as prepare himself for it; and why cannot he, but because he will not? And certainly if he will not, he cannot; it being impossible he should act any such thing contrary to his will: and therefore if he cannot will it, he cannot do it.

Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ[f] *preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have it.* In order to the doing of good it is not only necessary the grace of God should turn our wills to it, but assist our wills in it; it is not only necessary that himself sets us on work, but that himself also worketh with us. Without him we cannot begin a good work, without him we cannot carry it on, and without him too we cannot perfect it. And this is a conclusion that necessarily follows upon the premises. For if we cannot turn ourselves to God, we cannot do any thing that is good without the assistance of God himself, for we cannot do any thing that is good until we are first turned unto God. But of that hereafter. In the meanwhile here it may suffice to consider, whether it be true indeed that a man cannot turn himself to God, and prepare himself for God, unless he receive grace and power from him.

---

[f] Of God's preventing us with his grace the Fathers often speak. Qui prævenit nolentem ut velit, subsequitur volentem ne frustra velit. Aug. Quis nostrum dicit consentire proprium esse voluntatis, hoc est, ex propriis viribus? Non hoc dicimus, sed consentire ad voluntatem pertinere docemus, postquam præventa est a Domino et sic accepit consentiendi potestatem. Id. de grat. et lib. arbit. c. 11. Ipsum inquit velle credere aut converti non potest homo habere, nisi per gratiam prævenientem acceperit ut posset. Ibid. c. 15. Bonum propositum quidem adjuvat subsequens gratia, sed nec ipsum esset nisi præcederet gratia. Id. contra duas epist. Pelag. l. 2. [22. vol. X.] Ad has (sacras scripturas) si humilis et mitis accesseris, ibi profecto invenies et prævenientem gratiam qua potest elisus surgere, et comitantem qua viam recti queat itineris currere, et subsequentem qua valeat ad regni cœlestis beatitudinem pervenire. Fulgent. Epist. [VI. 12.] ad Theodor. de conversione. Prævenit igitur gratia impium ut fiat justus; subsequitur justum ne fiat impius: prævenit cæcum ut lumen quod non invenit donet; subsequitur videntem ut lumen quod contulit servet: prævenit elisum ut surgat; subsequitur elevatum ne cadat: prævenit donans homini bonam voluntatem; subsequitur benevolentem operando in illo boni operis facultatem. Hoc igitur ista misericordia Dei in homine subsequitur quod præveniens ipsa largitur. Id. de prædestinatione, ad Monimum, l. 1. [c. 11.]

And truly if it hath pleased my glorious Maker to entrust me with any understanding of his holy scriptures, this must needs be the purport and meaning of them; for what else can we understand by these words, *No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him*, John vi. 44? None can come by faith to God the Son, but he that is drawn by the grace of God the Father. Though God doth not drive us to Christ, yet he draws us to him[g]. He doth not drive us against our wills, but he draws us with our wills, making us *a willing people in the day of his power*, Psalm cx. 3; and until we be thus made willing by the Father we can never come unto the Son, *for no man can come to me except the Father draw him.* And certainly this was St. Paul's opinion also, when he said, *Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God*, 2 Cor. iii. 5. If we be not sufficient of ourselves to think a good thought, how can we be able without God to act true faith? *Our sufficiency*, saith he, *is of God;* if we be able to do any thing, it is he that makes us able; if we have any sufficiency, it is he that gives it. And therefore also it is that our Saviour saith, *He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me you can do nothing*, John xv. 5.[h] He doth not say, there are some things you cannot do without me, or there are many things you cannot do without me, but, *without me you can do nothing*, nothing good, nothing pleasing and acceptable unto God: whereas if we could either prepare ourselves [to turn,] or turn ourselves when prepared, without him, we should do much. And to put it out of doubt, the same Spirit tells us elsewhere, *For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure*[i], Philipp. ii. 13. It is he that first enables us to will what we ought to do, and then to do what we will. Both the grace we desire, and [k] our desire of grace, proceeds from him. Without him we could not have any grace we would, and without him we could not will to have any grace at all. So that I am not only bound to thank him for his bestowing grace upon me, but also for my desiring grace of him: for it is he that worketh in me both to will and to do, both to will and desire, and also to act and exercise grace; or, as it is here expressed in this article, it is he that *prevents us that we may have a good will*, and it is he that *worketh with us when we have that good will.* And therefore certainly without him we can neither prepare ourselves for conversion, nor convert ourselves after preparation, unless we can prepare ourselves without having a good will, or convert ourselves without acting of it: for it is he alone that giveth this good will to us, and it is he that acteth this good will in us, without whom we could not desire it before we have it, nor act it when we have it.

---

[g] Quid hic dicimus fratres? Si trahimur ad Christum ergo inviti credimus? ergo violentia adhibetur? non voluntas excitatur? Intrare quisquam ecclesiam potest nolens, accedere ad altare potest nolens, accipere potest sacramentum nolens, credere non potest nisi volens. Aug. in Joh. tract. 26. [2. vol. III. p. ii.] Noli te cogitare invitum trahi, trahitur animus et amore. Ibid. [4.] *Nemo potest venire ad me, nisi Pater qui misit me traxerit eum;* non enim ait duxerit, ut illic aliquo modo intelligamus præcedere voluntatem. Id. contra duas epist. Pelag. l. 1. [37. vol. X.] *Εἰ γάρ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν, φησὶ, τί δεῖ τῆς ἕλξεως; τοῦτο δὲ οὐ τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἀναιρεῖ, ἀλλὰ δείκνυσιν ἡμᾶς βοηθείας δεομένους· καὶ αἰνίττεται ἐνταῦθα οὐ τὸν ἄκοντα ἐρχόμενον ἀλλὰ τὸν πολλῆς ἀπολαύοντα συμμαχίας.* Chrysost. in Joh. hom. 46. [vol. II. p. 744. 31.]

---

[h] Ne quisquam putaret saltem parvum aliquem fructum posse a semetipso palmitem ferre, cum hæc dixisset, hic fert fructum multum, non ait quod sine me parum potestis facere, sed nihil potestis facere: sive ergo parum sive multum, sine illo fieri non potest, sine quo nihil fieri potest. Aug. in Joh. tract. 81. [3. vol. III. p. ii.]

[i] Thus the Syriac translation plainly renders the words, ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܥܝܪ ܒܟܘܢ ܐܦ ܠܡܨܒܐ ܐܦ ܠܡܥܒܕ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܒܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ i. e. *For God himself stirs up in you both to will, and also to do what you will.* As it is he that enables our hearts to will what to act, so it is he that enables our hands to act what we will.

[k] That the very first beginnings and desires of grace are from God, the fathers oft inculcate. Ex lege si ea legitime utamur confugimus ad gratiam; quis autem confugit nisi cum a Domino gressus viri diriguntur? at per hoc desiderare auxilium gratiæ initium est gratiæ. Aug. de corrept. et grat. [2. vol. X.] Hominis autem propositum bonum adjuvat quidem subsequens gratia, sed nec ipsum esset nisi præcederet gratia. Studium quoque hominis quod dicitur bonum quamvis cum esse cœperit adjuvetur gratia, non tamen incipit sine gratia. Aug. contra duas epist. Pelag. l. 2. [22. vol. X.] Quis istam etsi parvam dare cœperit charitatem, nisi ille qui præparat voluntatem, et cooperando perficit quod operando incipit? Quoniam ipse ut velimus operatur incipiens, qui volentibus cooperatur perficiens; propter quod ait apostolus, *Certus sum quoniam qui operatur in vobis opus bonum perficiet usque in diem Christi Jesu.* Ut ergo velimus sine nobis operatur; cum autem volumus, et sic volumus ut faciamus, nobiscum cooperatur. Tamen sine illo vel operante ut velimus vel cooperante cum volumus, ad bona pie-

Neither indeed can I in reason see how man should be able to turn himself from sin to holiness, from evil to good, as considering how he is not of himself able to discern betwixt good and evil, but still takes good for evil, and evil for good, Isa. v. 20, his understanding being so darkened that he can see nothing of God in God, nothing of holiness in holiness, nothing of good in good, nothing of evil in evil, nor any thing of sinfulness in sin. Nay, it is so darkened, that he fancies himself to see good in evil, and evil in good, happiness in sin, and misery in holiness. And therefore the apostle tells us, [1] *The*

---

tatis opera nihil valeamus. Id. de grat. et lib. arb. [33.] Hujus gratiæ adjutorium semper est nobis a Deo poscendum, sed ne ipsum quod poscimus nostris viribus assignemus: neque enim haberi potest ipse saltem orationis affectus nisi divinitus fuerit attributus. Ut ergo desideremus adjutorium gratiæ, hoc ipsum quoque opus est gratiæ. Ipsa namque incipit infundi ut incipiat posci; ipsa quoque amplius infunditur cum poscentibus datur. Fulgent. Epist. [6. 10.] ad Theodor. Non enim dicat meum esse velle credere, Dei autem gratiæ est adjuvare, sed dicat gratiæ Dei est adjuvare ut sit meum velle credere. Id. de incarnat. et grat. D. N. Jesu Christi. [Epist. 17. 35.]

[1] Ὥσπερ γὰρ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τούτοις οὐδεὶς ἂν τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καταμάθοι· οὕτως οὐδὲ ψυχὴ μόνη τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. καὶ τί λέγω τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; οὐδὲ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ ἅπαντα· καὶ γὰρ ὁρῶντες πύργον πόρρωθεν τετράγωνον στρογγύλον εἶναι νομίζομεν. Ἔστι δὲ ὀφθαλμῶν ἀπάτη τὰ τῆς τοιαύτης ὑπολήψεως· οὕτω τοίνυν καὶ ὅταν τὰ πόρρωθεν ἡμῶν πράγματα. διὰ τῆς διανοίας μόνης δοκιμάζῃ τις γέλως πολὺς ἕψεται· οὐ γὰρ μόνον οἷά περ ἐστὶν αὐτὰ οὐκ ὄψεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐναντία ὧν ἐστιν ἡγήσεται, διόπερ ἐπήγαγε, μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστι. Chrysost. in 1 Corinth. hom. 7. [vol. III. p. 284. 24.] Ὅτι οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται· τουτέστιν ὅτι πίστεως δεῖται τὰ λεγόμενα· καὶ λόγοις αὐτὰ καταλαβεῖν οὐκ ἔνι· ὑπερβαίνει γὰρ αὐτῶν τὸ μέγεθος ἐκ πολλοῦ τοῦ περιόντος τῆς ἡμετέρας διανοίας τὴν εὐτέλειαν. Ibid. Hence St. Augustine saith, Mentibus non minus necessariam esse illuminationis gratiam quam oculis lumen, imo oculos ipsi aperimus ad cernendam lucem: mentis autem oculi nisi a Domino aperiantur clausi manent. Aug. de peccat. mer. et remis. l. 2.

natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness to him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned, 1 Cor. ii. 14. He is so far from looking upon the wisdom of God as wisdom, that he looks upon it as foolishness. *Neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.* They are above his reach. So that a man may as well read the letter of the scripture without eyes, as receive the mysteries of the scriptures without grace. Now considering that the will always acteth according to the ultimate dictate of the practical understanding, so as to refuse whatsoever the practical understanding brings before it under the ugly dress of evil; and to choose whatsoever it presents to it under the notion of true good; and seeing that the natural understanding presents the will with evil instead of good, and good instead of evil; it must needs follow, that the will of itself cannot refuse but choose what is truly evil, nor choose but refuse what is truly good, unless it should cross the course of nature in choosing what the understanding saith is evil, and refusing what the understanding dictates as good. And therefore so long as a man is in his natural estate, it is impossible that of himself he should so much as look after any other, seeing he accounts his own present sinful condition to be the best, and that if he should change, he should but change for the worse.

Nay further, suppose the understanding should be so far enlightened as to discern the evil from the good, yet, for all that, it would be impossible for the will of itself to prefer the good before the evil. For though it be a constant rule in natural things for the will to follow the last conclusive sentence of the practical understanding, yet it is not so in spirituals. For though the understanding do present God as the chiefest good, and sin as the greatest evil, yet the will cannot of itself embrace the former nor refuse the latter as it ought to do, and that because itself is corrupted as well as the understanding. And therefore should the understanding perform its office aright, it doth not follow the will should be able to perform its aright too; for then all the fault would be in the understanding, and the will remain as perfect after its corruption as it was in its first creation. But seeing it cannot be denied but that the [m] will is vitiated and depraved as well as the understanding, it must needs be granted that the will is unable to do its duty as well as the understanding. And hence it is that we find in ourselves, that though God is pleased often so far to enlighten our dark understanding as to discover the beauty of holiness and sinfulness of sin to us, yet we cannot but hate and refuse the former, we cannot but receive and love the latter. This is that which St. Paul had the woful experience of: *For that which I do I allow not: for that which I would do, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.* Rom. vii. 15. And if it be so after, how much more is it so before conversion! And therefore it is requisite, in order to our conversion, that the understanding be not only so enlightened as to discern the evil from the good, but that our wills be so rectified as to prefer the good before the evil. By which rectifying, or bringing of the will into its right order again, its liberty is not destroyed [n] but healed; so that it is free after as well as before conversion; yea, free to God and holiness, as it was before free only to sin and wickedness.

---

[m] Hæc voluntas (animalis) vaga, incerta, instabilis, imperita, infirma ad efficiendum, facilis ad audiendum, in cupiditatibus cæca, in honoribus tumida, curis anxia, suspicionibus inquieta, gloriæ quam virtutum avidior, famæ quam conscientiæ diligentior, et per omnem suam experientiam miserior fruendo iis quæ concupiverit quam carendo, nihil in suis habet viribus nisi periculi facilitatem, quoniam voluntas mutabilis quæ non ab incommutabili voluntate regitur, tanto citius propinquat iniquitati, quanto acrius intenditur actioni. Prosper (al. Ambros.) de vocat. gent. l. 1. c. [6.] Licet insit homini bonum nolle, tamen nisi donatum non habet bonum velle. Et illud contraxit natura per culpam hoc recipit natura per gratiam. Ibid. c. [25.] And, in his poetical strain, l. de ingratis, c. 27. [p. 563.] the same Father sings thus:

——Hinc arbitrium per devia lapsum
Claudicat, et cæsis conatibus inque ligatis
Motus inest, non error abest: manet ergo voluntas
Semper amans aliquid quo se ferat, et labyrintho
Fallitur, ambages dubiarum ingressa viarum
Vana cupit, vanis tumet et timet, omnimodaque
Mobilitate ruens in vulnera vulnere surgit.

[n] Qua gratia humanum non aufertur sed sanatur, non adimitur sed corrigitur, non removetur sed illuminatur, non evacuatur sed adjuvatur atque servatur arbitrium, ut in quo infirmitatem homo habuit, in eo habere incipiat sanitatem; quo errabat eodem in viam redeat; in quo cæcus fuit, in eo accipiat lumen; et ubi fuit iniquus, serviens immunditiæ et iniquitati ad iniquitatem, ibi gratia præventus atque adjutus serviat justitiæ in sanctificationem. Fulgent. de incar. et grat. Christ. [Ep. 17. 41.] Ac per hoc sicut lex non evacuatur sed statuitur per fidem, quia fides impetrat gratiam qua lex impleatur; ita liberum arbitrium non evacuatur per gratiam sed statuitur, quia gratia sanat voluntatem qua justitia libere diligatur. Aug. de spiritu et lit. ad Marcellin. [52. vol. X. p. 114.]

And this was the doctrine of the primitive church. St. Augustine (in whose days [o]Pelagius first rose up against this truth) hath writ several volumes to this purpose, out of which I shall pick out only some few sentences for the confirmation of this truth. [p]"Neither," saith he, "doth a man begin to be converted or changed from evil to good by the beginnings of faith, unless the free and undeserved mercy of God work it in him." And presently, [q]"So therefore let the grace of God be accounted of, that from the beginning of his good conversion to the end of his perfection, he that glorieth should glory in the Lord. Because as none can begin a good work without the Lord, so none can perfect it without the Lord."

And elsewhere the same Father saith, [r]"That the grace of God by Jesus Christ our Lord (which the true faith and catholic church always holds) translates or converts both small and great from the death of the first man unto the life of the second, not only by blotting out their sins, but also by helping such as can use the liberty of the will not to sin, but to live holily; so as that unless he do help, we can have no piety or righteousness in word nor in will; *for it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.* For who but he that came to seek and to save that which was lost, can make any one differ from that mass of perdition? Wherefore the apostle asketh the question, saying, *For who made thee to differ?* Where if any one say, My faith, my will, my good work; it is answered him, *For what hast thou that thou hast not received?*" And again; [s]"For it is certain we may keep the commandments of God if we will; but because the will is prepared by the Lord, (it seems not by ourselves,) we must ask of him that we may will as much as is sufficient, that willing we might do. It is certain that we do will when we will, but it is he that makes us that we will what is good." And presently, [t]"It is certain that we act when we act, but it is he that maketh us to act, affording most effectual strength unto the will."

---

[o] Quis unquam ante profanum illum Pelagium tantam virtutem liberi præsumpsit arbitrii, ut ad hoc in bonis rebus per actus singulos adjuvandum necessariam Dei gratiam non putaret. Vincent. Lyrin. adv. hæres. l. 1. c. 34. [p. 108.]

[p] Nec omnino incipit homo ex malo in bonum per initium fidei commutari, nisi hoc in illo agat indebita et gratuita misericordia Dei. Aug. contra duas epist. Pelag. l. 2. [23. vol. X.]

[q] Sic itaque Dei gratia cogitetur, ut ab initio bonæ mutationis suæ usque in finem consummationis qui gloriatur in Domino glorietur. Quia sicut nemo potest bonum inchoare sine Domino, sic nemo perficere sine Domino. Ibid.

[r] Quod gratia Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum (quod fides vera et catholica tenet semper ecclesia) pusillos cum magnis a morte primi hominis ad vitam secundi hominis transfert, non solum peccata delendo verum etiam ad non peccandum recteque vivendum eos, qui jam uti possunt voluntatis arbitrio, sic adjuvando, ut nisi adjuvet, nihil pietatis atque justitiæ sive in opere sive etiam in ipsa voluntate habere possimus: *Deus enim operatur in nobis et velle et operari pro bona voluntate.* Nam quis nisi qui venit quærere et salvare quod perierat ab illa perditionis massa et contentione discernit? Unde apostolus interrogat dicens, *Quis enim te discernit?* Ubi si dixerit homo, Fides mea, voluntas mea, bonum opus meum, respondetur ei, *Quid enim habes quod non accepisti?* Aug. Epist. ad Paulinum. [186. 3. vol. II.]

And thus Maxentius tells us, [u]"We believe that the natural freewill is able to do no more than to discern and desire carnal or worldly things; which not with God, yet perhaps amongst men may seem glorious: but those things which belong to eternal life, it can neither think, nor will, nor desire, nor perform, but only by the infusion and inward working of the Holy Ghost, which is also the Spirit of Christ."

Fulgentius hath also many things to this purpose, that it is God that both prepares our hearts for grace, and increaseth that grace in our hearts. [x]"From whence we know," saith he, "it is from God that we are willing to do good, and that we are able to do good." And elsewhere, [y]"We have not therefore received the Spirit of God because we do believe, but that we may believe. For the same manner went before in the flesh of Christ, that we should spiritually acknowledge in our faith. For Christ the Son of God was according to the flesh conceived by the Holy Ghost and born; but that flesh the Virgin could neither conceive nor ever bring forth, unless the Holy Ghost had wrought the rising of the same flesh. And so in the heart of man faith can neither be conceived nor increased, unless the Holy Ghost doth both pour it in and nourish it." And therefore he tells us in another place, [z] "He delivers us not by finding faith in any man, but by giving it." And presently, [a] "But it is clear because, that a man should begin to believe in God, he receiveth from God repentance unto life; so that he could not believe at all unless he receiveth repentance by the gift of the merciful God. But what is man's repentance but the changing of the will? God therefore that giveth man repentance doth also change his will."

---

[s] Certum est enim nos servare mandata si volumus: sed quia præparatur voluntas a Domino ab illo petendum est ut tantum velimus quantum sufficit, ut volendo, faciamus. Certum est nos velle cum volumus, sed ille facit ut velimus bonum. Id. de gratia et libero arbitrio; ad Valentinum. [32. vol. X.]

[t] Certum est nos facere cum facimus, sed ille facit ut faciamus præbendo vires efficacissimas voluntati. Ibid.

[u] Liberum naturale arbitrium ad nihil aliud valere credimus nisi ad discernenda tantum et desideranda carnalia sive secularia; quæ non apud Deum sed apud homines possunt fortassis videri gloriosa: ad ea vero quæ ad vitam æternam pertinent nec cogitare, nec velle, nec desiderare, nec perficere posse, nisi per infusionem et inoperationem intrinsecus Spiritus Sancti, qui est etiam Spiritus Christi. Maxent. Confess. fidei. [Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. IX. p. 537.]

[x] Unde cognoscimus Dei esse ut bonum facere velimus, et ut bonum facere valeamus. Fulg. de prædest. ad Monim. l. 1. [cap. ix.]

[y] Non ergo Spiritum Sanctum quia credimus sed ut crederemus accepimus. Forma enim præcessit

The second council of Orange, an. Dom. 529, determined many things to this purpose; amongst the rest they say, [b] "If any man say that mercy is conferred by God upon us believing, willing, desiring, endeavouring, labouring, watching, studying, asking, seeking, knocking, without the grace of God,

---

in carne Christi quam in nostra fide spiritualiter agnoscamus. Nam Christus Filius Dei secundum carnem de Spiritu Sancto conceptus et natus est; carnem autem illam nec concipere virgo possit aliquando nec parere, nisi ejusdem carnis Spiritus Sanctus operaretur exortum. Sic ergo in hominis corde nec concipi fides poterit nec augeri, nisi eam Spiritus S. effundat et nutriat. Id. de incarn. et grat. Christi; [ep. xvii. 40.]

[z] Liberavit autem non in quolibet homine fidem inveniendo sed dando. Ibid. [34.]

[a] Claret tamen quia ut homo in Deum credere incipiat a Deo accipit pœnitentiam ad vitam, ita ut omnino credere non possit nisi pœnitentiam dono Dei miserantis acceperit. Quæ est autem pœnitentia hominis nisi mutatio voluntatis? Deus ergo qui homini pœnitentiam dat, ipse mutat hominis voluntatem. Ibid.

[b] Si quis sine gratia Dei credentibus, volentibus, desiderantibus, conantibus, laborantibus, vigilantibus, studentibus, petentibus, quærentibus, pulsantibus, nobis misericordiam dicit conferri divinitus, non autem ut credamus, velimus, vel hæc omnia sicut oportet agere valeamus per infusionem et inspirationem Spiritus S. in nobis fieri confitetur, et aut humilitati aut obedientiæ humanæ subjungit gratiæ adjutorium, nec ut obedientes et humiles simus ipsius gratiæ donum esse consensit, resistit Apostolo dicenti, *Quid habes quod non accepisti?* Et *gratia Dei sum id quod sum.* Concil. Arausic. II. Can. vi. [vol. II. p. 1099.]

but doth not confess that it is only by the infusion and inspiration of the Holy Ghost into us that we believe, will, and are able to do all these things as we ought to do, and maketh the help of grace to follow after either man's humility or obedience, nor will grant that it is the gift of grace itself that we are obedient and humble, he resisteth the apostle, saying, *What hast thou that thou hast not received?* and, *By the grace of God I am what I am.*"

And so the African council too: [c] "We determine that the sentence against Pelagius and Cœlestius, uttered by the reverend bishop Innocent from the see of the blessed apostle, do remain until they acknowledge by open confession, that the grace of God by Jesus Christ our Lord doth help us by single acts, not only to know, but also to do righteousness; so that without it we can neither have, think, speak, nor do any true and holy piety." So that we may well conclude this with that of Alcuinus; [d] "I could defile myself, but I cannot cleanse myself, unless thou, O Lord Jesu, by the sprinkling of thy blood, dost make me clean:" or that of Ambrosius Ansbertus; [e] "It is by God's preventing grace that we are saved, and it is by his subsequent grace that we are justified;" so that *we cannot turn or prepare ourselves, by our own strength, to faith and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have it.*

---

[c] Constituimus in Pelagium et Cœlestium per venerandum episcopum Innocentium de beatissimi Apostoli sede prolatam manere sententiam, donec apertissima confessione fateantur gratiam Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, non solum ad cognoscendam verum etiam ad faciendam justitiam nos per actus singulos adjuvare; ita ut sine illa nihil veræ sanctæque pietatis habere, cogitare, dicere, agere valeamus. Concil. African. apud Prosper. contra Collatorem. [p. 890.]

[d] Sordidare me potui sed emundare nequeo, nisi tu Domine Jesu sancti sanguinis tui aspersione mundum me facias. Alcuin. in Ps. 50. enar. [p. 66.]

[e] Præveniente gratia salvamur subsequente justificamur. Ambros. Ansbert. in Apoc. l. [ult. vol. X. p. 441.]

ARTICLE XI.

OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN.

We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own good works or deservings: wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the homily of Justification.

ORIGINAL sin (as we saw in the eighth article) being both the fault and corruption of the human nature, and so all of us not only defiled with it, but also guilty of it, man was thereby plunged into such a gulf of misery, that it is impossible for him in his own strength ever to recover himself from it. That he is not able to wash away that filth of sin that is inherent in him hath been proved in the foregoing article: that he is not able of himself to blot out that guilt of sin that lies upon him is asserted in this. There we see we could not be made righteous but by God's grace implanted in us; here we see we cannot be accounted righteous but by Christ's merits imputed to us. Where we may likewise observe, how whatsoever we lost in the first we gained in the second Adam. Are we accounted sinners by Adam's sin imputed to us? we are accounted righteous by Christ's righteousness laid upon us. Are we made sinners also by Adam's sin inherent in us? we are made righteous also by Christ's righteousness imparted to us; his Spirit being ours for the sanctification, as well as Adam's sin was ours for the corruption of our natures; and his merit ours for the justification, as well as Adam's transgression is ours for the condemnation of our persons.

By this merit it is that we are accounted righteous before God; where we may take notice by the way, how our being justified is here expressed by our being accounted righteous, and not by our being made righteous: for it is not by inhesion of grace in us, but by the imputation of righteousness to us that we are justified; as it is not by the imputation of righteousness to us, but by the inhesion of grace in us that we are sanctified. Thus we find the apostle, speaking of the justification of Abraham, saying, *Abraham believed God*, [a] *and*

---

[a] *Καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, Rom. iv. 3. which we translate, *And it was counted*, or imputed, *to him for righteousness;* which exposition of the words though it hath been much opposed, yet certainly this is both the most ancient and the truest notion of them. For so the Syriac, ܘܐܬܚܫܒܬ ܠܗ ܠܟܐܢܘܬܐ, Et reputatum est ei in justitiam, and presently, ܡܬܚܫܒܐ ܠܗ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ ܠܟܐܢܘܬܐ, Reputatur fides ei ad justitiam. Where we may observe how this translation renders the Greek *λογίζομαι* by ܚܫܒ: and so doth the Arabic also render it by حسب, חשב, in both places. So that what is the right notion of חשב in the Old, may well be admitted as the best interpretation of *λογίζομαι* in the New Testament. Now though חשב do sometimes signify simply *cogitavit, putavit,* yet we know how in the Hebrew language, where there is no composition of verbs, the compound is always implied in the simple, and therefore the simple still used to express the compound: e. g. בוא, that signifies simply *venit,* signifies also *advenit, pervenit, evenit, convenit,* &c. And so here חשב, that signifies simply *cogitavit, putavit,* signifies also *imputavit, reputavit, computavit, supputavit.* As דם יחשב לאיש ההוא, *Et imputabitur ei sanguis,* Levit. xvii. 4. as the Latin translation hath it. Jonathan expresses it clearly, אדם קטול יתחשב לגברא ההוא ותהי ליה כאילו אדם זכאי אשר; "The blood of homicide shall be imputed to him, and it shall be to him as if he had shed innocent blood." So that חשב here signifies such an imputation as makes a man accounted as if he had shed innocent blood, when in himself he was not guilty of it. And what נחשב here signifies, *λογίζομαι* in Greek must needs signify. For as in the New Testament the Oriental translations render the Greek *λογίζομαι* by חשב, so here the Greek translation renders חשב by *λογίζομαι, καὶ λογισθήσεται τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ αἷμα.* So Num. xviii. 27. ונחשב לכם; Syr. ܘܢܬܚܫܒ ܠܟܘܢ; Samaritan, ࠅࠍࠇࠔࠁ; Arabic, تكسب; i. e. as the Vulg. renders it, *Et reputetur vobis,* (whence by the way I cannot but something wonder why those that oppose the words *imputavit, reputavit,* &c. do not consider how their own vulgar translation makes use of them, yea, to express the Hebrew חשב, and so the Greek *λογίζομαι* by:) and as all the Oriental translations, as we see, still use the same word with the Hebrew, viz. חשב, so the Greek renders it by *λογίζομαι* here too, *Καὶ λογισθήσεται ὑμῖν.* And so I might easily shew how this word doth frequently signify to be counted or imputed; and if so in other places, why not in that also from whence the Apostle takes this sen-

it was counted to him for righteousness, Rom. iv. 3. And again, *But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness*, ver. 5. And if faith is accounted righteousness, we must needs be accounted righteous by faith; and so we are justified by faith that is accounted for righteousness to us, not by grace as a principle of righteousness in us. Which also further appears, in that justification is here said to be of the ungodly, *Who justifieth the ungodly.* For so long as a man is ungodly, he cannot be said to be justified by any inward and inherent, but only by an outward and imputed righteousness; so that justification is properly opposed to accusation. So St. Paul plainly; *Who will lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died.* Rom. viii. 33, 34. Who shall accuse or lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? the Devil? their own consciences? But it is God that will justify and account them righteous. How? Because they are righteous in themselves? No; but because Christ's merits are imputed to them: who is therefore said *to be made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*, 2 Cor. v. 21. How was Christ made sin for us? Not by our sins inherent in him, that is horrid blasphemy; but by our sins imputed to him, that is true divinity. And as he was made sin for us, not by the inhesion of our sins in him, but by the imputation of our sins to him, so are we made the righteousness of God in him, by the imputation of his righteousness to us, not by the inhesion of his righteousness in us. He was accounted as a sinner, and therefore punished for us; we are accounted as righteous,

---

tence, viz. Gen. xv. 6. והאמן ביהוה ויחשבה לו צדקה, which the LXX. render, Καὶ *ἐπίστευσεν* Ἀβραὰμ *τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, the very words which the apostle quoteth in the place we are speaking to, *It was counted* or *imputed to him for righteousness.* So that both the Hebrew חשב and the Greek *λογίζομαι* do both import an external imputation of a thing to a man, not an internal inhesion of it in him. And therefore the righteousness that is here said *λογίζεσθαι*, is not any thing in ourselves to whom it is imputed, but in him who doth impute it. And therefore may the place well be translated, *it was counted, reckoned*, or *imputed to him:* and therefore they do but beat the air while they cavil at this place, especially considering that the Hebrew חשב, which they pretend makes so much for them, makes more against them.

and therefore glorified in him. [b]Our sins were laid upon him, and therefore he died for us in time; his righteousness is laid upon us, and therefore we shall live with him to eternity. Thus was the innocent punished as if he was guilty, that the guilty might be rewarded as if they were innocent. And thus are we accounted as righteous in him, as he was accounted as a sinner for us. He was accounted as a sinner for us, and therefore he was condemned; we are accounted as righteous in him, and therefore we are justified. And this is the right notion of justification as distinguished from sanctification. Not as if these two were severed or divided in their subjects; no, every one that is justified is also sanctified, and every one that is sanctified is also justified. But yet the acts of justification and sanctification are two distinct things: for the one denotes the imputation of righteousness to us; the other denotes the implantation of righteousness in us. And therefore, though they be both the acts of God, yet the one is the act of God towards us, and the other is the act of God in us. Our [c]justification is in God only, not in ourselves; our sanctification is in ourselves only, and not in God. By our sanctification we are made righteous in ourselves, but not accounted righteous by God; by our justification we are accounted righteous by God, but not made righteous in ourselves.

---

[b] *Longe a facie mea verba delictorum meorum.* Quorum delictorum de quo dictum est, *qui peccatum non fecit nec inventus est dolus in ore ejus?* Quomodo ergo dicit *delictorum meorum,* nisi quia pro delictis nostris ille precatur, et delicta nostra sua delicta fecit, ut justitiam suam nostram justitiam faceret? Aug. in Psa. xxi. Expos. sec. [3. vol. IV.]

[c] There are many expressions in the Fathers that import so much, that our justification is in God only, not in ourselves: as, Ipse ergo peccatum, ut nos justitia, non nostra sed Dei; nec in nobis sed in ipso. Aug. Enchirid. ad Laurent. [13. vol. VI.] Ipsa quoque nostra justitia quamvis vera sit propter veri boni finem ad quem refertur, tamen tanta est in hac vita, ut potius peccatorum remissione constat quam perfectione virtutum. Id. de civitate Dei, l. 19. c. 27. init. [vol. VII.] Sufficit mihi ad omnem justitiam solum habere propitium cui soli peccavi: omne quod mihi ipse non imputare decreverit sic est quasi non fuerit. Non peccare Dei justitia est; hominis justitia indulgentia Dei. Bernard. in Cant. hom. 23. Ἐκείνη γὰρ ἡ προτέρα, νόμου καὶ ἔργων δικαιοσύνη, αὕτη δὲ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη. Chrysost. [vol. III. p. 611.] in 2 Corinth. hom. 11. Tunc ergo justi sumus quando nos peccatores fatemur. Et justitia nostra non ex proprio merito sed ex Dei consistit misericordia. Hieron. adv. Pelag. l. 1. [13. vol. II.]

And we are thus justified, or *accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, and not for our own works.* As it is not by our own strength that we can be sanctified in ourselves, so it is not by our own works that we can be justified before God. But as it is only by the Spirit of Christ that our natures can be made, so it is only by the merit of Christ that our persons can be accounted righteous. And seeing this merit of Christ is made over unto us by our faith in him, we are therefore said *to be justified by faith*, not as it is an act in us, but as it applies Christ to us. We are therefore said to be justified by faith in Christ, because we should not be justified by Christ without faith. *Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the homily Of Justification*, whither I refer the reader for more satisfaction in that particular; I in the meanwhile endeavouring to demonstrate, that this doctrine, that we are justified by faith only without works, is not only wholesome and comfortable doctrine, but also consonant both to the scripture, reason, and Fathers.

And first for the scriptures; what mystery do they more clearly open, what truth do they more expressly assert, than this? Let us hear St. Paul's judgment in the case: *Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law*[d], Rom. iii. 28: that a [e]man, in general any man, high or low, Jew or Gentile, every one that is justified, is justified only by faith in Christ, not by the deeds of the law. And again: *Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified,* Gal. ii. 16. *For by grace are ye saved*

---

[d] Sin autem scribit, *Existimamus fide justificari hominem sine operibus, siquidem unus est Deus qui justificat circumcisionem ex fide et præputium per fidem,* manifeste ostendit non in hominis merito sed in Dei gratia esse justitiam, qui sine legis operibus credentium suscipit fidem. Hieron. adv. Pelag. l. 2. [7. vol. II.]

[e] Οὐκ εἶπεν Ἰουδαῖον ἢ τὸν ὑπὸ τὸν νόμον ὄντα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξαγαγὼν τὸν λόγον εἰς εὐρυχωρίαν καὶ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ τὰς θύρας ἀνοίξας τῆς σωτηρίας, φησὶν ἄνθρωπον, τὸ κοινὸν τῆς φύσεως ὄνομα θείς. Chrysost. in loc. [vol. III. p. 48.]

through faith ; and that not of yourselves ; it is the gift of God ; not of works, lest any man should boast, Ephes. ii. 8, 9. Hence it is that we find the same apostle saying elsewhere, *Yea doubtless, and I account all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord : for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do account them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having my own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith*, Phil. iii. 8, 9. This doctrine the apostle also confirms in Abraham. That Abraham was accounted righteous we all grant : but how, by the works of the law? No ; *he believed God, and that was accounted to him for righteousness*, Gen. xv. 6. Rom. iv. 3. Now if Abraham, who performed so many good works by faith, and yet was justified by faith, and not by those good works, this (as St. Chrysostome [f] observes) doth much debase the merits of works and exalt the power of faith. And [g] St. Augustine takes notice how he here brings in Abraham for an example of our justification by faith, to shew that our being justified by faith, and not by works, should not at all lessen our endeavours after good works, but rather heighten them, seeing that Abraham, who was justified by faith, was also full of good works ; though it was not by those good works, but by faith, that he was justified. And so any man, though it be not for his good works he doth that he is justified, yet if he be justified, he will do good works. And in this sense it is that St. James tells us *that a man is justified by works, and not*

---

[f] Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἄνω καὶ κάτω τοῦτο ἔστρεφον Ἰουδαῖοι, ὅτι ὁ πατριάρχης καὶ τῷ Θεῷ φίλος περιτομὴν ἐδέξατο πρῶτος, βούλεται δεῖξαι ὅτι καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐκ πίστεως ἐδικαιώθη· ὅπερ ἦν περιουσία νίκης πολλῆς· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔργα μὴ ἔχοντα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῆναί τινα, οὐδὲν ἀπεικός· τὸ δὲ κομῶντα ἐν κατορθώμασι μὴ ἐντεῦθεν ἀλλ' ἀπὸ πίστεως γενέσθαι δίκαιον, τοῦτο ἦν θαυμαστὸν, καὶ μάλιστα τῆς πίστεως τὴν ἰσχὺν ἐμφαίνον. Chrysost. in Rom. hom. 8. [p. 55.]

[g] Ideoque magis Abrahæ utitur exemplo, vacuam esse fidem si non bene operetur, quoniam Abrahæ exemplo etiam Paulus apostolus usus est, ut probaret, *Justificari hominem sine operibus legis.* Cum enim bona opera commemorat Abrahæ, quæ ejus fidem comitata sunt, satis ostendit Paulum apostolum non ita per Abraham docere justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus, ut si quis crediderit, non ad eum pertineat bene operari ; sed ad hoc potius, ut nemo meritis priorum bonorum operum arbitretur se pervenire ad donum justificationis quæ est in fide. Aug. l. 83. quæst. q. 76. [vol. VI.]

by faith only, Jac. ii. 24; *and faith without works is dead*, ver. 26: that is, though it is by faith we are justified, and by faith only, yet not by such a faith as hath no works accompanying of it: no, every such faith is a dead faith; so that faith without works is as unable to justify us, as works without faith. And yet it is not from the works that accompany our faith, but from the faith which is accompanied by our works, that we are justified. And therefore St. Paul and St. James do not contradict each other[h]; for the one speaks of the works which go before, the other speaks of the works that follow after justification. A man is justified by faith only, and not by works; but a man that is justified cannot but have works also as well as faith. And as his person is justified by faith only before God, so is his faith justified by works only before men and his own conscience. It is by faith only, and not by works, that a man is accounted righteous in heaven; but it is by works only, and not by faith, that a man is esteemed righteous upon earth. So that though a man be justified by his faith that goes before, we do not know that he is justified but only by his works that follow after.

And, indeed, were the scriptures silent in this point, even in shewing that we are justified by faith only, and not by works, my reason would not suffer me to contradict it. For how is it possible that the works of finite creatures, or [i] any thing but the merits of Christ, should be able to blot out the sins that are committed against an infinite Creator? or that the fig-leaves of our own pretended merits should hide our nakedness from the eyes of an all-seeing God? And if we cannot expiate our sins, how can we justify our persons? If we cannot but be accounted sinners for all our works, how can we be accounted as righteous for any of them? especially considering that whatsoever we have or are, is God's; our souls, bodies, estates, time, parts, gifts, all is God's; and therefore whatsoever we do, we are bound to do it for him, seeing whatsoever we have, we have received from him. What therefore, if I should fast my body into a skeleton, and pray my tongue, and hear my ears, to their very stumps? What though I should water my couch continually with my tears, fasten my knees always to the earth by prayer, and fix my eyes constantly into heaven by meditation? What though I should give every thing I have to my poor distressed neighbours, and spend each moment of my time in the immediate worshipping of my glorious Maker? Would any of this be more than I am bound to do? Should not I still be an unprofitable servant? And [k]if I can do no more than is my duty unto God, how can I merit any thing by what I do for him? How can he be indebted unto me for my paying of what I owe to him?

---

[h] Quare non sunt sibi contrariæ duorum apostolorum sententiæ Pauli et Jacobi, cum dicit unus justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus, et alius inanem esse fidem sine operibus. Quia ille dicit de operibus quæ fidem præcedunt, iste de his quæ fidem sequuntur. Ibid.

[i] Τί γὰρ ἄλλο τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἠδυνήθη καλύψαι ἢ ἐκείνου δικαιοσύνη; ἐν τίνι δικαιωθῆναι δυνατὸν τοὺς ἀνόμους ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀσεβεῖς, ἢ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ Υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ; Justin. Epist. ad Diognet. [9.]

But suppose the case for once, though it be a strange, and to me an irrational supposition, that we may merit something from God by our obedience to him; but what? must nothing less than eternal glories be accepted as a just reward for temporal duties? What! nothing less than justification here, and salvation hereafter, merited by a few weak performances? Seriously, I wonder how any one should suffer such a thought to creep into his heart, much more that any one should lodge it there, and then use all his endeavour to defend it. Certainly if any one do, he must either have very high thoughts of his own merits, or very low ones of God's presence. For my own part, it is a greater happiness I expect when dead, than I am able to deserve whilst I am alive. And I am sure the [l] Fathers long before me had higher thoughts of the glories of heaven, than to think that they could be merited by duties upon earth.

---

[k] *Δούλῳ γὰρ ἀνάγκη ἐπίκειται τὸ πληροῦν τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Κυρίου, οὐ μὴν ὡς κατόρθωμα ἐπιγράφεσθαι ἑαυτῷ τοῦτο ὀφείλει· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐργάσηται πληγῶν ἀξιωτεός· ἐπεὶ δὲ εἰργάσατο ἀρκείσθω ὅτι τὰς πληγὰς ἐξέφυγεν, οὐ μὴν ὀφείλει ἐπὶ τούτῳ τιμὴν ζητεῖν ἀναγκαίως.* Theophyl. in Luc. 17. [p. 466.] *Οὐκ ἀπαιτεῖ δοῦλος ὡς μισθὸν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλὰ εὐαρεστεῖν ὡς ὀφειλέτης, καὶ κατὰ χάριν ἐκδέχεται.* Marc. Heremit. Περὶ τῶν *οἰομένων ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι.* c. 3. [vol. I. p. 889.] *Εἰ Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανε κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, καὶ οὐ ζῶμεν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι, δηλονότι δουλεύειν αὐτῷ ἕως θανάτου κεχρεωστήκαμεν, πῶς οὖν ὀφειλομένην τὴν υἱοθεσίαν λογισόμεθα*; Ibid. c. 19. [p. 890.]

[l] Quis nostrum sine divina potest subsistere miseratione? Quid possumus dignum præmiis facere cælestibus? Quis nostrum ita assurgit in hoc corpore ut animum suum elevet quo jugiter adhæreat Christo? Quo tandem hominum merito defertur ut hæc corruptibilis caro induat incorruptionem? Et mortale

But that we cannot possibly be justified by good works is also clear, in that it is impossible for us to do any good works before we be justified. Nay, (as we shall see in the next article but one,) works before justification are all sins: and therefore whatsoever we do before justification is so far from justifying, that it will but more condemn us; so far from meriting the least happiness, that it rather deserves the greatest misery. To which we might also consider, how as

---

hoc induat immortalitatem? Quibus laboribus, quibus injuriis possumus nostra levare peccata? Indignæ sunt passiones hujus temporis ad superventuram gloriam. Non ergo secundum merita nostra sed secundum misericordiam Dei cælestium decretorum in homines forma procedit. Ambros. in Ps. 118. Octon 20. [42.] *Μηδὲ νομίζωμεν χρονίζειν ἢ μέγα τὶ ποιεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς δόξαν.* Anton. apud Athanas. in Vit. Anton. [17. vol. I. p. 909.] *Τὰ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ δῶρα πόλλῳ τῷ μέτρῳ ὑπερβαίνει τὴν εὐτέλειαν τῶν κατορθωμάτων τῶν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σπουδὴν γινομένων.* Chrysost. in Philip. hom. 11. [vol. IV. p. 65.] *Οὐδεὶς γὰρ τοιαύτην ἐπιδείκνυται πολιτείαν ὡς βασιλείας ἀξιωθῆναι· ἀλλὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ δωρεᾶς ἐστι τὸ πᾶν.* Id. in Colos. hom. 2. [p. 98.] *Κᾂν γὰρ μυρία κατορθώσωμεν ἀπὸ οἰκτιρμῶν ἀκουόμεθα καὶ φιλανθρωπίας· κᾂν πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀνέλθωμεν τῆς ἀρετῆς τὴν κορυφὴν ἀπὸ ἐλέους σωζόμεθα.* Id. in Psa. 4. [vol. I. p. 526.] *Καὶ γὰρ μυριάκις ἀποθάνωμεν κᾂν πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἐπιδειξώμεθα οὐδὲ τὴν ἀξίαν τὸ πολλοστὸν ἀποδεδώκαμεν τῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς ὑπηργμένων παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τιμῶν.* Id. *Πρὸς τὸν Στελέχιον περὶ κατανύξεως.* [vol. VI. p. 157.] *Βλέπεις πῶς πᾶσα ἕως θανάτου ἐπιτελουμένη [ἀρετὴ] οὐδὲν ἕτερον, ἢ ἁμαρτίας ἀποχή; ἁμαρτίας δὲ ἀποχὴ φύσεώς ἐστιν ἔργον οὐ βασιλείας ἀντάλλαγμα.* Marc. Heremit. de iis qui putant ex operibus justificari, c. 24. *Πρὸς τὸ δόμα οὖν ὃ μέλλουσι κληρονομεῖν τοῦτο ἄν τις ὀρθῶς εἴποι, εἰ ἕκαστος ἀφ' οὗ ἐκτίσθη ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου ἐπολέμει πρὸς τὸν Σατανᾶν καὶ ὑπέμεινε τὰς θλίψεις, οὐδὲν μέγα ἐποίει πρὸς τὴν δόξαν ἣν μέλλει κληρονομεῖν· συμβασιλεύσει γὰρ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας μετὰ Χριστοῦ.* Macar. Herem. Ægypt. hom. 15. [31.] Totis licet et animæ et corporis laboribus desudemus, totis licet obedientiæ viribus exerceamur, nihil tamen condignum merito pro cælestibus bonis compensare et offerre valeamus. Non valent vitæ præsentis obsequia æternæ vitæ gaudiis comparari. Euseb. Emissen. ad Monach. serm. 3. [p. 98.] Nihil moleste potest sustineri in hac vita mortali, quod cælestibus gaudiis ex æquo respondere sufficiat. Petr. Bles. in Job. 42. [p. 424.] Gratia autem etiam ipsa vita æterna non injuste dicitur, quia non solum donis suis Deus dona sua reddit, sed quia tantum etiam ibi gratia divinæ retributionis exuberat, ut incomparabiliter atque ineffabiliter omne meritum, quamvis bonæ et ex Deo datæ, humanæ voluntatis atque operationis excedat. Fulgent. de prædestinatione, ad Monim. l. 1. [10.] Nam ut taceam quod merita omnia dona Dei sunt, et ita homo magis propter ipsa Deo debitor est quam Deus homini, quid sunt merita omnia ad tantam gloriam? Bern. Serm. prim. in annunc. B. Mariæ, [p. 160.]

all we do by our own strength is a sin, so whatsoever we do well, we do by the strength of God; and therefore we are so far from deserving any thing from him, that we are but more bound to him for our good works. Whensoever we do any thing for God, we do not pay him what we owe to him, but he is pleased still to lend more to us. And how can we deserve any thing from God by being more beholden to him? If I sin, I must thank myself for it[m]; if I do good, I must thank my God for it, being more indebted to him for every good work I do by him; and if I be more indebted to him for my doing of good works, certainly he cannot be indebted to me the rewarding of them. No, it is of God's grace that we do any thing that is good here, and it is of God's grace too if we receive any thing that is good hereafter. And as I shall be bound to thank God for the perfection of glory in heaven, so also for the beginning of grace on earth; it being of his own infinite mercy that he fills our hearts with grace in time, and of his own infinite mercy too that he crowns [n] his own grace with glory to eternity.

And as for the Fathers, what more frequent in their writings than that we are justified by faith only without works? Primasius tells us, [o] "God justifieth the wicked by faith only, and not by works which he had not: for if according to his works, he should be punished rather than redeemed." And Sedulias to the same purpose; [p] "God justifieth a converting sinner by faith only, not by good works which before he had not, otherwise he should be punished for his wicked works." Whence Ennodius saith, [q] "If the heavenly Governor should look upon my merit, I should get either little good or great punishments." And Polycarp tells the Philippians, [r] "But believing ye shall rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, into which many desire to enter; knowing that ye are saved by grace, not by works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ."

---

[m] Tua peccata sunt, merita Dei sunt. Aug. in Psa. LII. [ii. 5. vol. IV.] Ipsa vita æterna quæ in fine habebitur, et ideo meritis præcedentibus redditur, tamen quia eadem merita quibus redditur, non a nobis parata sunt per nostram sufficientiam, sed in nobis facta per gratiam, etiam ipsa gratia nuncupatur, non ob aliud nisi quia gratis datur; nec ideo quia meritis non datur, sed quia data sunt et ipsa merita quibus datur. Id. Epist. [194. 19. vol. II.] ad Sixtum Roman. presbyterum. Vix mihi suadeo quod possit ullum opus esse quod ex debito remunerationem Dei deposcat, cum etiam hoc ipsum quod agere aliquid possumus, vel cogitare, vel proloqui ipsius dono et largitione faciamus. Origen. in Rom. l. 4. [vol. IV. p. 522.] Neque enim talia sunt hominum merita, ut propter ea vita æterna deberetur ex jure, aut Deus injuriam aliquam faceret nisi eam donaret. Nam ut taceam quod merita omnia dona Dei sunt, et ita homo magis propter ipsa Deo debitor est quam Deus homini, &c. Bernard. in annunciat. B. Mar. serm. 1. [p. 160.] Ὅσα γὰρ ἂν τις προσενέγκῃ Θεῷ ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ αὐτοῦ προσφέρει αὐτῷ. Agapet. Paræn. ad Justinianum Cæsarem. [c. 43.]

[n] Nihil enim aliud quam gratiam suam coronat in nobis Deus. Radulph. Dom. in Septuag. hom. 2. Supplicium tibi debetur et cum præmium venerit sua dona coronabit non tua merita. Aug. in Psa. lxx. [ii. 5. vol. IV.]

[o] Impium per solam fidem justificat, non opera quæ non habuit. Si enim secundum opera, puniendus erat non liberandus. Primas. in Rom. 4. [19.]

St. Basil also hath delivered the same doctrine: [s] "But this," saith he, "is the perfect and only glorying in God, when one is not lifted up with his own righteousness, but acknowledgeth that he wanteth the true righteousness, and that it is by faith only in Christ that he can be justified." And again; [t] "Everlasting rest is laid up for them that strive lawfully in this present life, not to be given according to the debt of works, but exhibited according to the grace of the bountiful God to such as hope in him."

St. Chrysostome also, speaking of Abraham; [u] "For what did he lose by not being under the law? Nothing; for faith alone was sufficient for his justification or righteousness." With which agreeth that of St. Hierome; [x] "The faith of

---

[p] Convertentem impium per solam fidem justificat Deus, non per bona opera quæ non habuit prius, alioquin per impietatis opera fuerat puniendus. Sedul. in Rom. 4.

[q] Meritum meum regnator cælestis si attenderet, aut exigua bona adipiscerer, aut magna supplicia. Ennod. l. 2. epist. 10. ad Faust. [Bibl. Max. patr. vol. ix.]

[r] Credentes autem gaudebitis gaudio inenarrabili et glorificato, in quod multi desiderant introire, scientes quia gratia salvi facti estis, non ex operibus, sed in voluntate Dei per Jesum Christum. Polycarp. Epist. ad Philip. [p. 14.]

[s] Αὕτη γὰρ δὴ ἡ τέλεια καὶ ὁλόκληρος καύχησις ἐν Θεῷ, ὅτε μήτε ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τὶς ἐπαίρεται τῇ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔγνω μὲν ἐνδεῆ ὄντα ἑαυτὸν δικαιοσύνης ἀληθοῦς, πίστει δὲ μόνῃ τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν δεδικαιωμένον. Basil. hom. 22. de humil. [vol. I. p. 473.]

[t] Πρόκειται γὰρ ἀνάπαυσις αἰωνία τοῖς νομίμως τὸν ἐνταῦθα διαθλήσασι βίον· οὐ κατ' ὀφείλημα τῶν ἔργων ἀποδεδομένη, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χάριν τοῦ μεγαλοδώρου Θεοῦ τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν ἠλπικόσι παρεχομένη. Id. in Psa. cxiv. [ibid. p. 267.]

[u] Τί γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἐβλάβη μὴ γενόμενος ὑπὸ νόμον; οὐδὲν, ἀλλ' ἤρκεσεν ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην αὐτῷ. Chrysost. in Gal. c. 3. [vol. III. p. 738.]

[x] Tam magna fuit fides Abrahæ ut et pristina ei peccata donarentur, et sola pro omni justitia doceretur accepta. Hieron. [vol. XI.] in Rom. 4.

Abraham was so great, that both all his old sins should be forgiven, and that should be taught to be accepted for all righteousness." And elsewhere; [y] "*Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness;* and so will faith alone suffice you also for righteousness." And presently; [z] "But because none is justified by the law, seeing none keeps it, it is therefore said that believers are to be justified by faith only." And so Claudius the monk saith, [a] "That Abraham believed, and the consent of his naked faith only is accounted for the full crown of his righteousness and merit." And Œcumenius; [b] "Wherefore all that believe in Christ are freely justified, bringing their faith only along with them." [c] "Yea it is necessary," saith Smaragdus, "that believers should be saved only by the faith of Christ."

St. Ambrose also upon these words, *His faith was accounted for righteousness*, saith, [d] "He speaketh this, because without the works of the law to every sinner, that is, to every Gentile that believeth in Christ, his faith is counted to him for righteousness, as it was to Abraham. How therefore can the Jews think to be justified by the works of the law, and yet as Abraham was justified; when they see that Abraham was not justified by the works of the law, but by faith only? There is no need therefore of the law, (as to our justification,) seeing a sinner is justified before God by faith only."

And St. Bernard, speaking of Christ; [e] "Thou art as strong to justify, as much in pardoning of us. Wherefore whosoever, being pricked at the heart for his sins, hungers and thirsteth after righteousness, let him believe in Thee, who justifies the ungodly; and being justified by faith only, he shall have peace with God." And long before him, Origen upon those words, *We conclude, therefore, that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law,* saith, [f] "And he saith, that the justification of faith only is sufficient; so that if any one do but only believe, he may be justified, though no good work hath been fulfilled by him." And then he goes on to prove it by the example of the thief upon the cross, concluding, [g] "For this thief was justified by faith, without the works of the law; because about this the Lord did not inquire what he had before done, neither did he stay to see what work he would perform after he had believed; but being justified by his confession only, he going into paradise carried him as a companion along with him."

---

[y] *Abraham credidit Deo, et reputatum est ei ad justitiam.* Ita et vobis ad justitiam sola sufficit fides. Id. in Gal. 3.

[z] *Quoniam autem in lege nemo justificatur:* quia nemo illam servat, ideo dictum est quod sola fide justificandi essent credentes. Ibid.

[a] At ille credidit, et nudæ fidei consensio sola plenam ad justitiæ et meriti reputata coronam est. Claud. Mar. in Gen. l. 3. [pp. 61, 62.]

[b] Διὸ πάντες πιστεύσαντες εἰς Χριστὸν δωρεὰν δικαιοῦνται, τὸ πιστεύειν μόνον συνεισάγοντες. Œcum. in Rom. 3.

[c] Necesse est sola fide Christi salvari credentes. Smaragd. in Gal. 3.

[d] Hoc dicit quia sine operibus legis credenti impio, id est gentili, in Christum, reputatur fides ejus ad justitiam, sicut et Abrahæ. Quomodo ergo Judæi per opera legis justificari se putant justificatione Abrahæ, cum vident Abraham non ex operibus legis, sed sola fide justificatum? Non ergo opus est lege, quando impius per solam fidem justificatur apud Deum. Ambros. in Rom. 4. [vol. II. App. p. 48.]

[e] Tam validus denique es ad justificandum, quam multus ab ignoscendum. Quamobrem quisquis pro peccatis compunctus esurit et sitit justitiam, credat in te qui justificas impium, et solam justificatus per fidem pacem habebit apud Deum. Bernard. in Cantic. 22. [p. 812.]

But before all these, Clemens Romanus himself, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, hath delivered this doctrine fully and clearly, saying, [h] "Wherefore and we also, being called by the will of God in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, or by our own wisdom, or knowledge, or holiness, or works that we have done in the simplicity of heart, but by faith, by which the Almighty God justified all from the beginning." So that it is no new doctrine, but hath been the doctrine of the church of Christ in all ages, that we are justified by faith only, and not by works.

---

[f] Et dicit sufficere solius fidei justificationem, ita ut credens aliquis tantummodo justificetur, etiamsi nihil ab eo operis fuerit expletum. Origen. in Rom. 3. [vol. IV. p. 516.]

[g] Per fidem enim justificatus est hic latro sine operibus legis, quia super hoc Dominus non requisivit quid prius esset operatus, nec expectavit quid operis cum credidisset expleret, sed sola confessione justificatum comitemque sibi paradisum ingressurus assumpsit. Ibid. [p. 517.]

[h] Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι᾽ ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι᾽ ἧς πάντας τοὺς ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν. Clem. ad Corinth. [32.] V. et Chrysost. de fide et lege naturæ, p. 838. vol. VI.

ARTICLE XII.

OF GOOD WORKS.

Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's wrath; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

ALTHOUGH it hath pleased the great God of his infinite mercy, in the covenant of grace, to entail justification upon our faith in his promises only, and not upon obedience to his precepts; as he had in the covenant of works entailed it upon obedience to his precepts, and not upon faith in his promises only; yet it doth not follow that we are freed more from our obedience now than we were before. No; but as when we were to be justified by our works, we were then bound to believe as well as to obey, though we were to be justified by our obedience, not by our faith; so now we are to be justified by faith we are still bound to obey as well as to believe, though we are justified by our faith only, and not by our obedience. So that though our justification doth pardon the sins we have committed heretofore, [a] yet it doth not give us liberty to commit sin hereafter. No; but now we are justified by faith without works, we are bound as much to obey as if we were to be justified by works without faith. And the reason is, because though we be justified by faith only, and not by works, yet we cannot be justified by such a faith as is without works. As works without faith cannot justify us, so neither can faith without works justify us; not because works help to justify us with faith, but because [b]faith is no justifying faith without works: or rather, because we can have no such true and lively faith as can justify us without works, but we shall necessarily have works also accompanying of our faith. Though still it be not by our works that accompany our faith, but by our faith only that is accompanied by our works that we are accounted righteous before God.

---

[a] Ex quibus omnibus claret quod recte arbitratur apostolus, justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus legis. Sed fortassis hæc aliquis audiens resolvatur, et bene agendi negligentiam capiat, siquidem ad justificandum fides sola sufficit. Ad quem dicemus, quia post justificationem si injuste aliquis agat, sine dubio justificationis gratiam sprevit. Neque ob hoc aliquis accipit veniam peccatorum, ut rursum sibi putet peccandi licentiam datam. Indulgentia namque non futurorum sed præteritorum criminum datur. Origen. in Rom. l. 3. [vol. IV. p. 517.] Cum ergo dicit apostolus arbitrari se justificari hominem per fidem sine

And hence it is, after it is determined in the foregoing article that we are justified by faith only and not by works, it is immediately in this asserted, that works are pleasing and acceptable to God as well as faith; though it be for our faith only, and not for our works that God accepts of us, yet our works as well as faith are acceptable unto God: yea, and that they necessarily spring out from a true and lively faith, so that it is as impossible there should be true faith without good works, as that there should be good works without true faith; for as without faith our works are bad, so without works our

---

operibus legis, non hoc agit ut percepta ac professa fide opera justitiæ contemnantur, sed ut sciat se quisque per fidem posse justificari, etiamsi legis opera non præcesserint. Aug. de fide et operibus. [21. vol. VI.]

[b] Quis est qui non credit quod Jesus est Christus? Qui non sic vivit quomodo præcepit Christus. Multi enim dicunt Credo, sed fides sine operibus non salvat. Aug. in epist. Johan. tract. 10. [1. vol. III. par. ii.] Quoniam ergo hæc opinio tunc fuerat exorta, aliæ apostolicæ epistolæ Petri, Johannis, Jacobi, Judæ, contra eam maxime dirigunt intentionem, ut vehementer asserant fidem sine operibus nihil prodesse. Sicut etiam ipse Paulus non qualemlibet fidem qua in Deum creditur, sed et eam salubrem plane quam evangelicam definivit, cujus opera ex dilectione procedunt. *Et fides,* inquit, *quæ per dilectionem operatur.* Unde illam fidem quæ sufficere ad salutem quibusdam videtur, ita nihil prodesse asseverat ut dicat, *Si habeam omnem fidem ita ut montes transferam, charitatem autem non habeam, nihil sum.* Ubi autem hæc fidelis charitas operatur, sine dubio bene vivitur, plenitudo enim legis charitas. Id. de fide et operibus. [c. xiii. s. 21.] Μὴ δὴ *νόμιζε ὅτε ἡ πίστις, εἴγε πίστιν χρὴ καλεῖν τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν σῶν ἐλεγχομένην, σῶσαί σε δυνήσεται.* [Isidor.] Pelusiot. l. 3. epist. 73.

faith is dead. And therefore may a true faith be as evidently known by its works, as a tree is clearly discerned by its fruit. If I see fruit growing upon a tree, I know what tree it is upon which such fruit grows. And so if I see how a man lives, I know by that how he believes. If his faith be good, his works cannot but be good too; and if his works be bad, his faith cannot but be bad too. For wheresoever there is a justifying faith there are also good works; and wheresoever there are no good works there is no justifying faith. The sum is this: though works do not justify us as well as faith, yet they are pleasing unto God as well as faith; and that wheresoever there is faith there are also good works, as wheresoever there are good works there is also faith. Which doctrine is grounded upon and consonant to both scripture, reason, and Fathers.

As, first, that good works are pleasing unto God, how frequently hath God himself, who best knows what is pleasing to himself, taught us in his holy scripture? for thus saith the Lord of hosts by his apostle Paul: *I exhort, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour.* 1 Tim. ii. 1—3. And again: *Children, obey your parents: for this is well pleasing to the Lord.* Coloss. iii. 20. And therefore saith St. Paul, *But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing unto God.* Phil. iv. 18. Thus hath [c] *Enoch this*

---

[c] He that looketh for this testimony of Enoch, that he pleased God, in the Hebrew Bible, will look in vain; but if you look into the Septuagint, there be sure you will find it: for where it is said, ויתהלך חנוך את האלהים, *And Enoch walked with God,* Gen. v. 22, the Septuagint translates it εὐηρέστησε δὲ Ἐνὼχ τῷ Θεῷ; and so indeed doth the Syriac render it also, ܘܫܦܪ ܚܢܘܟ ܠܐܠܗܐ, *And Enoch pleased God.* Now the Septuagint translation of the Bible being most in use at that time when he wrote, the apostle here (as also elsewhere) doth not quote this testimony of Enoch as it is recorded in Hebrew, but as it is translated into Greek. And howsoever, *he pleased God* is tantamount to *he walked with God:* for he could not please God unless he walked with him; neither could he walk with him but he would please him. And therefore

testimony, that he pleased God, Heb. xi. 5. And St. Paul having exhorted the Thessalonians to good works, adds, *Furthermore we beseech you, brethren, and exhort you by the Lord Jesus Christ, that as ye have received from us how ye ought to walk and to please God, so you would abound more and more,* 1 Thess. iv. 1. Thus hath it pleased the Lord to acquaint us how much he is pleased with our obeying him.

And that good works do constantly accompany that faith that justifieth us before God, as well as pleaseth that God that justifies us by faith, is likewise clear from scripture. For St. Paul, speaking of this saving justifying faith, saith, it *worketh by love*, Gal. v. 6; and the same apostle tells us elsewhere, that *love is the fulfilling of the whole law*, Rom. xiii. 10: and if faith worketh by love, and love be the fulfilling of the law, then faith and the fulfilling of the law must needs go together. Thus St. John tells us, *Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God*, 1 John v. 1. And the same apostle tells us in the same Epistle, *Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin*, 1 John iii. 9. And if whosoever truly believes is born of God, and whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, then whosoever truly believes doth not commit sin, and he that doth not commit sin must needs perform duty. And therefore St. Paul saith from God, or God by him, *But if any one provide not for his own, and especially for them of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel*, 1 Tim. v. 8. So that he that neglects his duty denies the faith, and he therefore that keeps his faith must needs perform his duty. He that doth really as well as seemingly believe will provide for his family; and he that doth not provide for his family doth not really but only seemingly believe; for he *denies the faith, and is worse than an infidel.*

---

to expound what it was to *walk with God*, they translate it, Εὐηρέστησε τῷ Θεῷ. And so when the like phrase is used concerning Noah, את האלהים התהלך נח, *Noah walked with God*, Gen. vi. 9, the Septuagint render it again, Τῷ Θεῷ εὐηρέστησε Νῶε, the Syr. ܘܫܦܪ ܢܘܚ ܠܐܠܗܐ, *And Noah pleased God.* And so the Arabic too here, though not in the other place, expresseth it by فارضي نوح الله, *Et Noah placuit Deo.* And thus though the words of the testimony of Enoch be not to be found in the original, yet the sense is, and the very words too, in these several translations.

For as St. John tells us, *And every man that hath this hope in him purifies himself, even as he is pure*, 1 John iii. 3. So that he that hath a lively hope and saving faith in Christ purifies himself; and whosoever doth not purify himself, hath not that lively hope and saving faith in Christ. I shall name but one place more: *For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also*, James ii. 26. And if faith without works be dead, be sure no saving justifying faith can be without works; for every saving faith is a living faith, yea, therefore living because saving, and therefore saving because living. Now if all faith without works be dead, and all saving faith is alive, it must needs follow that all saving faith hath works necessarily proceeding from it: for if it hath not, it would be a dead, and so no saving faith.

Having grounded these truths upon scripture, we might clear them from reason; but as for the first, it is clear of itself, that good works are pleasing unto God, for it is his will they should be done, and therefore cannot but be his pleasure when done. He hath commanded them to be performed by us, and therefore when performed cannot but accept of them from us. For that which is of his commanding cannot but be of his accepting. And to this we might consider also, how it is he alone who doth not only command good works to be performed by us, but doth himself perform his own commandments in us. So that there is nothing done by us for God, but is done by God in us. We can sin of ourselves, and so be offensive to him [d]; but we cannot be good of ourselves, unless we be assisted by him. For he [e] being the chiefest good, there can be no good in any thing or action but what proceeds from him; and seeing he himself is the first mover of all our actions, and the only cause of all the good in them, certainly he cannot but be well pleased with them: for otherwise he would not be well pleased with his own actions, which he cannot but be well pleased with, nothing coming from him but what is infinitely pleasing to him. Nay, in that they are good, himself must needs be in them, and therefore he must needs be pleased with them, himself being all pleasure and happiness to himself.

---

[d] Quapropter multa Deus facit in homine bona quæ non facit homo; nulla vero facit homo quæ non facit Deus ut faciat homo. Aug. contra duas epist. Pelag. l. 2. [21. vol. X.] Quid est enim boni cupiditas, nisi charitas, de qua Johannes apostolus sine ambiguitate loquitur dicens, *Charitas ex Deo est.* Nec initium ejus ex nobis et perfectio ejus ex Deo, sed si charitas ex Deo, tota nobis ex Deo est. Ibid. Bona quantacunque quamvis magna quamvis minima nisi ex Deo esse non possunt. Id. de vera innocent. c. [380. vol. X. p. 251. App.] Non solum magna sed etiam minima bona non esse posse nisi ab illo, a quo sunt omnia bona, id est a Deo. Id. in argument. ad lib. de libero arbitrio. [p. 567. vol. I.] Et quia quæcunque nobis facienda donat, sicut habere non possumus, nisi ipse nobis largiatur, sic facere non possumus, nisi ipse nobis quæ largitus est operetur. Fulg. ad Mon. l. 1. [14.]

[e] Omnis infidelium vita peccatum est, et nihil est bonum sine summo

And that these good works do necessarily spring from faith is as clear, in that faith is an uniting grace, that unites Christ to us and us to Christ; so that by faith we dwell in Christ and Christ dwells in us; as the apostle saith, *That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith*, Eph. iii. 17. Now wheresoever any of Christ is, there all of Christ is; and therefore if Christ dwell in us, the Spirit of Christ must needs dwell in us too; and where the Spirit of Christ is, there is the principle and fountain of all good works, which cannot but issue forth acts of piety towards God and charity towards our neighbour.

But I needed not to have gone so far to have proved, that every one that hath true faith hath the Spirit of God; for a man must have the Spirit of God before he can have true faith. [f] For the Spirit doth not first work faith in us, and then come itself to us, but it first cometh itself to us, and then worketh faith in us. So that he that believes must needs have the Spirit; for unless he had the Spirit he could not believe. And where the Spirit of God is, there is the spring of goodness, from whence the streams of goodness must needs flow. So that he that saith a man may believe and not do good works, must either say a man may believe and yet not have the Spirit, or that a man may have the Spirit in him and yet good works not be performed by him: which cannot be, for in that it is a Spirit, it is an active principle always

---

bono. Aug. de vera innocentia, c. 106. [vol. X. p. 230. App.] Proinde cupiditas boni non homini a Domino esset si bonum non esset. Si autem bonum est, non nisi ab illo nobis est qui summe atque incommutabiliter bonus est. Id. contra duas literas Pelag. l. 2. [21. vol. X.]

[f] Non ergo Spiritum Sanctum quia credimus, sed ut crederemus accepimus. Fulg. de incarn. et grat. Christi. [cap. 17. 40.] Liberavit autem non in quolibet homine fidem inveniendo sed dando. Ibid. [34.]

doing; and in that it is the Spirit of God, it is a holy principle, and therefore must always be doing good.

Neither were these truths unheard of, or not consented to by the Fathers. Let these few speak for the rest. First, for good works, that they are pleasing unto God, Clemens Romanus having asserted the truth delivered in the former article, that we are justified by faith only, (as we may there see him quoted,) he presently adds what is asserted in this, saying, [g] "What therefore shall we do, brethren? Shall we cease from doing good, and leave off love and charity? The Lord will by no means suffer that to be done by us; but let us haste with all diligence and alacrity to perfect every good work: for the Creator himself and Lord of all things rejoiceth in his own works."

And Irenæus, having rehearsed the principal articles of the Christian faith, saith, [h] "This faith they that have believed without learning, as to our language they are barbarous, but as to their judgment, custom, and conversation, by reason of their faith, they are very wise, and please God, having their conversation in righteousness, chastity, and wisdom. So that to have our conversation in righteousness, chastity, and wisdom is to please God." So Justin tells us, [i] "They that do such things as are universally, naturally, and eternally good are wellpleasing unto God."

St. Hilary speaks fully to the purpose: [k] "But our works," saith he, "must be lift up unto the holy things of God, that is, in clothing the naked, in feeding the hungry, in giving drink to the thirsty, in comforting the afflicted, in helping the oppressed, in loving all. For these things sanctify us in the frailty of our body; these things please God, and are holy." And Theophilus Antiochenus saith, [l] "He understandeth all these things who inquireth into the wisdom of God, studying to please him by faith, righteousness, and good works." But I need not produce any more witnesses for the confirmation of so clear a truth.

---

[g] *Τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν ἀδελφοί; ἀργάσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγαθοποιίας, καὶ ἐγκαταλείπωμεν τὴν ἀγάπην; μηδαμῶς τοῦτο ἐάσαι ὁ δεσπότης ἐφ᾽ ἡμῖν γεννηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ σπεύσωμεν μετ᾽ ἐκτενείας καὶ προθυμίας πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελεῖν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ ἀγαλλιᾶται.* Clem. ep. ad Corinth. [33.]

[h] Hanc fidem qui sine literis crediderunt, quantum ad sermonem nostrum barbari sunt, quantum autem ad sententiam, et consuetudinem, et conversationem propter fidem perquam sapientissimi sunt, et placent Deo, conversantes in omni justitia, castitate et sapientia. Iren. adv. hæres. l. 3. c. 4. [2.]

[i] *Ἐπεὶ οἱ τὰ καθόλου, καὶ φύσει, καὶ αἰώνια καλὰ ἐποίουν, εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ.* Justin. dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. [45.]

[k] Elevanda autem opera nostra sunt in Dei sancta, id est, in nudis vestiendis, in esurientibus cibandis, in sitientibus potandis, in afflictis consolandis, in oppressis adjuvandis, in omnibus diligendis. Hæc enim nos in hac corporis infirmitate sanctificant, hæc Deo placent et sancta sunt. Hilar. enar. in Psa. 133. [5.]

And that faith and works always go together the Fathers are also express. As Origen: [m] "And this faith when it is justified sticks in the ground of the soul as a root that hath received the shower into it, that when it begins to be tilled by the law of God the branches may rise from it that bear the fruit of good works. The root of righteousness therefore doth not grow from works, but the fruit of works from the root of righteousness, to wit, that root of righteousness whereby God accepts of righteousness without works, viz. faith." And St. Augustine to the same purpose: [n] "Faith is in the soul as a good root, which turns the rain into fruit." And therefore doth Polycarp tell the Philippians, [o] "And that the firmness of your faith remaineth from the beginning until now, and bringeth forth fruit in the Lord Jesus Christ." And Clemens Alexandrinus, [p] "Charity with love to faith makes believers, but faith is the foundation of charity, bringing forth welldoing."

So Proclus, speaking of faith and charity, saith, [q] "They both go together; for faith is the glass of charity, and charity is the foundation of faith." So Prosper: [r] "Faith, which is the foundation of righteousness, which no good works precede, from which all good works proceed, itself purgeth us from sin, enlightens our minds, reconciles us to God, associates us with all that are partakers of our nature, inspires into us the hope of the future reward, increaseth in us holy virtues, and confirms us in the possession of them." Who can speak more fully and clearly to the case in hand?

---

[l] Hæc omnia intelligit qui Dei sapientiam exquirit, studens ei placere per fidem, justitiam et bona opera. Theoph. Antioch. ad Autolic. l. 2. fin.

[m] Et hæc fides cum justificata fuerit, tanquam radix imbre suscepto hæret in animæ solo, ut cum per legem Dei excoli cœperit, surgant in eo rami qui fructus operum ferunt. Non ergo ex operibus radix justitiæ, sed ex radice justitiæ fructus operum crescit, illa scilicet radice justitiæ, qua Deus accepto fert justitiam sine operibus. Origen. in Rom. l. 4. [vol. IV. p. 523.]

[n] Fides sic est in anima ut radix bona quæ pluviam in fructum ducit. Aug. præf. in Psa. 139. init. [vol. IV.]

[o] Et quia firmitas fidei vestræ a principio usque nunc permanet et fructificat in Domino Jesu Christo. Polycarp. epist. ad Philip. [p. 14.]

[p] Ἡ μὲν ἀγάπη τῇ πρὸς τὴν πίστιν φιλίᾳ τοὺς πιστοὺς ποιεῖ· ἡ δὲ πίστις ἕδρασμα ἀγάπης ἀντεπάγουσα τὴν εὐποιΐαν. Clem. Alex. Strom. 2. [p. 445.]

[q] Ἑκατέρα τοίνυν ἀλλήλαις συμβαίνει· ἡ μὲν γὰρ πίστις ἔσοπτρόν ἐστιν ἀγάπης, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη βεβαίωσις ὑπάρχει πίστεως. Procl. in Armen. [Bibl. Vet. Patr. fol. *Par.* 1624. vol. I. p. 311.]

I shall add but two more; viz. Salvian: [s] "Seeing, as we have said, this is the faith of a Christian, faithfully to keep the commands of Christ; it is so without all doubt, that he hath no faith that is an infidel, neither doth he believe in Christ that tramples upon the commands of Christ; and therefore he that doth believe cannot but obey them." And St. Chrysostome: [t] "As soon as ever thou believest, thou wilt be adorned also with good works. Not because it is wanting to other works, but because faith is of itself full of good works." And thus we see how faith is the root of works, and works the fruit of faith; and therefore we cannot but conclude, that faith may be as evidently known by its works as a tree is discerned by the fruit.

---

[r] Fides quæ est justitiæ fundamentum quam nulla bona opera præcedunt, et ex qua omnia procedunt, ipsa nos a peccatis purgat, mentes nostras illuminat, Deo reconciliat, cunctis participibus naturæ nostræ consociat, spem nobis futuræ remunerationis inspirat, auget in nobis virtutes sanctas, ac nos in earum possessione confirmat. Prosper. de vita contemplat. [l. III.] c. 21.

[s] Cum ut diximus hoc sit hominis Christiani fides, fideliter Christi mandata servare, fit absque dubio ut nec fidem habeat qui infidelis est, nec Christum credat qui Christi mandata conculcat. Salvian. de provid. l. 4. [init.]

[t] *Οὐκ οὖν ἅμα ἐπίστευσας ἅμα καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις ἐκόμησας· οὐχ ὅτι καὶ ἐλλείπῃ πρὸς τὰ ἔργα, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι καθ᾽ ἑαυτὴν πίστις πλήρης ἐστὶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων.* Chrysost. *περὶ πίστεως καὶ εἰς τὸν περὶ φύσεως νόμον,* tom. VI. p. 838.

ARTICLE XIII.

OF WORKS BEFORE JUSTIFICATION.

Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not out of faith in Jesu Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

AS man was created by God, he had power so to continue in the state of integrity[a] that he had power also to fall down into a state of sin and misery; but as he was corrupted in Adam, he hath power to continue in his state of sin and misery, but no power of himself to rise up again into a state of holiness and integrity. Then his will was free, both to the good and evil; now it is free to the evil, not to the good. Then he could have chosen whether he would have sinned or no; now of himself he cannot choose but sin, or he can choose nothing but sin. After our creation and before our corruption, we had power to do every thing pleasing unto God; but after our corruption and before our regeneration, we have power to do nothing pleasing unto God. Though we have power to do such things as in themselves are pleasing unto God, yet we have not power so to do those things that our doing them should be pleasing unto him. The matter of the actions we do may be accepted, but our manner of doing them is still rejected. Because though we do the thing that God commands of ourselves, yet we can never do it in the way that God commands.

---

[a] Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites primos homines, id est, Adam et mulierem ejus bonos et rectos et sine peccato creatos esse cum libero arbitrio, quo possent si vellent humili et bona voluntate servire atque obedire, quo arbitrio etiam possent si vellent propria voluntate peccare, eosque non necessitate sed propria voluntate peccasse. Aug. de fide ad Petrum, 21. [68. vol. VI. App.] Quapropter bina ista quid inter se differant diligenter et vigilanter intuendum est, posse non peccare, et non posse peccare; posse non mori, et non posse mori; bonum posse non deserere, et bonum non posse deserere. Potuit enim non peccare primus homo, potuit non mori, potuit bonum non deserere: nunquid dicturi sumus non potuit peccare qui tale habebat liberum arbitrium? Id. de corrept. et grat. [33. vol. X.] Credimus itaque bonum et sine ulla carnis impugnatione a creatore omnium factum Adam, magnaque præditum libertate, ita ut et bonum facere in propria facultate haberet, et malum si vellet posset admittere. Fulgent. de incarn. et grat. Christi. [epist. xvi. 15.]

And hence it is here said, that there is nothing that we do before we receive grace can make us meet to receive grace, or, as the schoolmen say, "deserve grace of [b] congruity;" that is, we can do nothing for which it is so much as meet that God should bestow any thing upon us. As we cannot do any thing which it is just God should reward, and so deserve grace of condignity; so neither can we do any thing which it is fit or meet God should reward, and so deserve grace of congruity. So that God should not do what is unmeet and unfitting to be done, though he never reward any of the works of mere natural men. And the reason is clearly here asserted, *Because they have all the nature of sin.* And if they have the nature of sin and iniquity, certainly they cannot deserve grace of congruity. So that it cannot be meet that God should reward them, nay, it is rather meet he should not reward them. Nay, it is not only meet he should not reward them, but it is meet and just too that he should punish them [c]; justice requiring sin to be punished as well as virtue to be rewarded: and therefore if thy works be sins, they cannot in justice be rewarded, but punished.

---

[b] Congruum est opus cui de justitia non debeatur merces, sed tamen ex congruitate quadam. Soto de nat. et gratia, l. 2. c. 4. Nempe si doctioribus creditur, illud dicitur esse meritum de condigno, cui merces reddenda est secundum justitiæ debitum, ita sane ut inter meritum et mercedem attendatur æqualitas quantitatis, quemadmodum in commutativa justitia tantum quantum. De congruo autem dicitur quis mereri, cum scilicet inter meritum et præmium non paritas quantitatis sed proportionis dicitur. Romæus. [p. 163.]

[c] *Ὁσίου τῶν καλλίστων μόνον ἐστὶν ἡ εὐγνωμοσύνη καὶ ἀπόδοσις· τοῦ δὲ δικαίου καὶ ἡ τῶν κακῶν δοκιμασία καὶ ἀνταπόδοσις.* Basil. Reg. brevior. interrog. 249. [vol. II.]

But the only question here to be determined is, whether they be indeed sins or no. For if they be sins, there is nothing in this article but must be acknowledged for a real truth. For here it is asserted, that works before grace are not pleasing unto God, which if they be sins they surely cannot be; for he can be pleased with nothing but what is conformable to his will and nature; yea, therefore, because any thing is conformable to his will and nature he is pleased with it. But sin is so far from being conformable, that it is flat contrary to both. So that so long as he is God he cannot but hate sin, and to be pleased with sin would be to act contrary to himself. And as if the works of sinners be all sin they cannot be pleasing unto God, so neither can they deserve any thing from him but punishments. For in that they displease him, they must needs deserve his displeasure; and in that they deserve his displeasure, they must needs deserve the greatest of punishments, his displeasure itself being the greatest of punishments. But now that all the works of unregenerate men are indeed sins appears both from scripture, reason, and Fathers.

As for the scripture, it tells us, *The plowing of the wicked is sin*, Prov. xxi. 4; yea, *The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord*, ch. xv. 8. And [d] again, *The sacrifice of the*

---

[d] The ancient translations all carry the sense in this place another way. The words in the original are, זבח רשעים תועבה אף כי בזמה יביאנו, which the Vulg. translates, *Hostiæ impiorum abominabiles, quia offeruntur ex scelere.* And so the LXX, Θυσίαι ἀσεβῶν βδέλυγμα Κυρίῳ, καὶ γὰρ παρανόμως προσφέρουσιν αὐτὰς, which the Arabic follows κατὰ πόδα: and so the Syriac, ܘܕܒܚܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܛܡܐܐ ܗܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܒܥܘܠܐ ܡܩܪܒܝܢ ܠܗ, i.e. *The sacrifice of the wicked is unclean, because they offer it wickedly:* and so indeed the Targum too, מטול דבעברתא מיתי ליה, *because they offer it in wickedness.* So that they all took אף כי to signify severally *et quia;* whereas when they come together in a negative sentence they signify *quanto minus;* as, *The heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee,* אף כי הבית הזה, *how much less this house that I have built?* 1 Reg. viii. 27. In an affirmative sentence, *quanto magis;* as, *Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth,* אף כי רשע וחוטא, *how much more the wicked and the sinner?* Prov. xi. 31; which the LXX. translates, Εἰ ὁ μὲν δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται; And it is observable, that not only the Syriac and Arabic translations, but the apostle Peter himself, in his quotation of

wicked is an abomination: how much more, when he bringeth it with a wicked mind? ch. xxi. 27. So that though he should possibly bring it with a good mind, yet, seeing he is a wicked man that brings it, it is an abomination to the Lord. And therefore he saith, *I hate, I despise your feast-days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though you offer me burnt-offerings, and your meat-offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts.* Amos v. 21, 22. *He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol. Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations.* Isa. lxvi. 3. *To what purpose therefore cometh there to me incense from Shebah? and the sweet cane from a far country? your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet unto me.* Jer. vi. 20. *To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. When you come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; and the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even your solemn meetings,* Isa. i. 11, 12, 13. And the reason is because, *As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are altogether become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.* Rom. iii. 10, 11, 12. Not one of those that are bad persons can do any good actions: but the best of their performances, as well as the worst of their iniquities, is an abomination to the Lord.

Neither doth reason itself contradict this truth. For

---

this place, doth not follow the original, but the LXX, though here they much differ from it, Καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται; 1 Pet. iv. 18. Now this being the right notion of אף כי, whensoever they come together in the original, our translators cannot be condemned, but commended, for leaving the translations to stick to the text itself, in this as in other places, [and] rendering the phrase אף כי here, as it denotes elsewhere, even *how much more.*

reason itself, as well as scripture, saith, that [e] *a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit*, Matt. vii. 18; nay, *a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit*, ver. 17. As the tree is upon which the fruit grows, so will the fruit be that grows upon that tree. If the tree be good, the fruit cannot be bad; and if the tree be bad, the fruit cannot be good. And so if a man's person be righteous, his actions will be holy; but his actions cannot but be sinful if his person be wicked. For it is the person that doth the actions whom God looks at in the first place, and then at the action that is done by the person. And therefore though the action be in itself good that the person doth, yet if the person be bad that doth the action, the action cannot but be bad too, as well as the person. For though the righteousness of a man's person can never make a bad action good, yet the wickedness of a man's person doth always make a good action bad. And therefore though a good man may do a bad act, yet a bad man can never do a good act.

But neither is the person only of a wicked man rejected, but his actions are also deficient; and if they be defective in any one thing, that is enough to denominate them sins. An action cannot be good unless it be perfect in all things; but an action is bad that is defective but in one thing. But now how many things are there that all the actions of wicked men are defective in? There are two things especially they are defective in. And the first is that named in this article, even that they do not spring from faith in Jesus Christ. And the apostle tells us, that *without faith it is impossible to please God*, Heb. xi. 6. *For whatsoever is not of faith is sin*, Rom. xiv. 23. Now that a wicked man hath not faith is clear, in that if he had faith he would not be a wicked man. For faith empties the heart of sin, and fills it up with grace. Faith justifies our persons, and sanctifies our natures. By faith we are accounted righteous before God, and made righteous by him. And therefore he that hath true faith can be no wicked man: and therefore also every wicked man can have no faith; and if he hath not faith, he cannot but sin against God, as the [f] Fathers long ago preached. And again, as what a wicked man doth is a sin, because not proceeding from faith, [g] so it is a sin also in that it is not directed to a right end: for a bad intention always makes even a good action bad, though a good intention can never make a bad action good. Now that all wicked men have wicked ends in all their actions is manifest, in that they are wicked men, men without the true knowledge of God, and men without the sincere love unto God. Now all such as do not truly know and love the God of glory can never sincerely aim at the glory of God in what they do. For what I do not know, I cannot love; what I do not love, I cannot desire; what I do not desire, I can never intend. And therefore if I do not know God, I can never intend his glory in my actions. And if I do not intend his glory in my actions, I sin upon that very account, because I do not intend his glory. For then I transgress the command wherein he enjoins me, that *whether I eat or drink, or whatsoever I do, I should do all to his glory*, 1 Cor. x. 30.

---

[e] Istæ duæ arbores manifestissime in similitudine duorum hominum positæ sunt, id est justi et injusti; quia nisi quisquam voluntatem mutaverit, bonum operari non potest. Aug. contra Adimant. Manichæum, c. 26. [vol. VIII. p. 147.] Ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐ τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι τὸν πονηρὸν ἀμήχανον μεταβάλλεσθαι, ἢ τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἀδύνατον μεταπεσεῖν, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἕως ἂν ᾖ πονηρίᾳ συζῶν, οὐ δυνήσεται καρπὸν ἀγαθὸν ἐνεγκεῖν· μεταβάλλειν μὲν γὰρ εἰς ἀρετὴν δύναται πονηρὸς ὢν, μένων δὲ ἐν πονηρίᾳ καρπὸν οὐκ οἴσει καλόν. Chrysost. in loc. [vol. II. p. 168.]

---

[f] Sunt quippe isti fideles, aut si fidem non habent Christi, profecto nec justi sunt, nec Deo placent, cum sine fide placere impossibile est. Aug. contra Julian. Pel. l. iv. [25. vol. X.] Si gentilis, inquis, nudum operuerit, nunquid quia non est ex fide, peccatum est? Prorsus in quantum non est ex fide peccatum est: non quia per seipsum factum, quod est nudum operire, peccatum est; sed de tali opere non in Domino gloriari solus impius negat esse peccatum. Ibid. [30.] Omne enim, velis nolis, quod non est ex fide peccatum est. Ibid. [32.] Ἡ πίστις τὸν ἐπιστρεφόμενον πολίτην οὐρανῶν ἀποδείκνυσιν· ἡ πίστις τὸν ἀπὸ γῆς ἄνθρωπον Θεοῦ συνόμιλον ἀπεργάζεται· οὐδέν ἐστιν ἔξω πίστεως ἀγαθόν. Chrysost. Περὶ πίστεως καὶ εἰς τὸν περὶ φύσεως νόμον, vol. VI. p. 838. Et omne quod non est ex fide peccatum est, ut scilicet intelligat justitiam infidelium non esse justitiam, quia sordet natura sine gratia. Prosper. Epist. ad Ruffin. [p. 307.] Si fides non prima in corde nostro gignitur, reliqua quæque bona esse non possunt, etiamsi bona videantur. Gregor. Moral. l. 2. [71.] Quicquid sine fide præsumitur nulla est animi solida virtus, sed ventosa quædam inflatio et tumor inanis. Bernard. serm. [5.] de ascens. Fides namque est bonorum omnium fundamentum. Aug. in prol. in l. de fide ad Petrum. [vol. VI. App. 1.] Extra ecclesiam catholicam nihil est integrum, nihil castum, dicente apostolo, *Omne quod non est ex fide peccatum est.* Leo serm. 2. de jejun. Pentecostes. [vol. I. p. 331.] Non ergo irrationabiliter a quibusdam astruitur, quod omnes actiones et voluntates hominis sine fide malæ sunt, quæ fide habita bonæ existunt. Lomb. l. 2. Sent. dist. 41.

[g] Noveris itaque quod non officiis, sed finibus, a vitiis discernendas esse virtutes. Officium est autem quod faciendum est, finis vero propter quod faciendum est. Cum itaque facit homo aliquid ubi peccare non videtur, si non propter hoc facit, propter quod facere debet, peccare convincitur. Aug. contra Julian. Pelag. l. 4. [21.] Quicquid autem boni fit ab homine, et non propter hoc fit, propter quod fieri debere vera sapientia percipit, etsi officio videatur bonum, ipso non recto fine peccatum est. Ibid. [21.] Sunt opera quæ videntur bona sine fide Christi; et non sunt bona quia non referuntur ad eum finem ex quo sunt bona. Id. in Joh. tract. 25. [12. vol. III.]

But I needed not to have gone so far to have proved that a wicked man cannot do a good work. For there is nothing good without the chiefest good; neither can any one please God but by the assistance of God himself. For I cannot see how God can be pleased with any thing but himself considering how he was infinitely pleased with himself before there was any thing else for him to be pleased with but himself; and therefore cannot be more pleased now there are other things made by himself; and by consequence, whatsoever thing he is pleased with, it is not the thing itself, but himself in the thing, he is pleased with. And the more of himself is in any thing, the more is himself pleased with it: and so the less of himself is in any thing, the less is that thing pleasing to him. Now it is plain a wicked man is *without God in the world*, Eph. ii. 12, and by consequence God not within him. For if he was in God, and God in him, it would be impossible he should be a wicked man. And seeing there is nothing of God implanted in him, there can be nothing pleasing unto God performed by him. And whatsoever is not pleasing unto God cannot be good, it being impossible for himself not to be pleased with what is truly good, seeing himself is the chiefest good. And therefore every thing that is good must needs proceed from himself, whom he cannot but be infinitely pleased withal. And therefore we cannot but in reason also acknowledge, that a man, before he hath received grace from God, can do nothing pleasing to him, yea, nothing but displeasing to him, nothing but sin.

And this was the doctrine delivered by the primitive church. St. Basil propounds the question, [h] whether it be possible, and a thing pleasing and acceptable unto God, for one that is the servant of sin to perform righteousness, according to the rule of the saints' piety; and he determines it from several places of scripture that it is not, concluding thus: [i] "It is clear that it is altogether impossible, and displeasing unto God, and dangerous to him that dares to do it. Wherefore I exhort, as the Lord teacheth, *Let us first make the tree good, and then the fruit good;* and let us *first make clean the inside of the cup or platter*, and then the outside will be wholly clean. And being taught by the apostle, *Let us purify ourselves from all the pollutions both of flesh and spirit, and then we shall perfect holiness in the love of Christ*, that we may be well-pleasing to God, and acceptable to the Lord, unto the kingdom of heaven." Clearly shewing that until we first be good we can never do good.

---

[h] Εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν, ἢ εὐάρεστον, ἢ εὐπρόσδεκτον Θεῷ, τὸν ἁμαρτίᾳ δουλεύοντα ποιεῖν δικαίωμα κατὰ τὸν τῆς θεοσεβείας τῶν ἁγίων κάνονα. Basil. de baptismo, l. 2. quæst. 7.

This was the doctrine that St. Augustine defended; [k] "Be it far from us" (saith he) "to think that true virtue should be in any one, unless he be a righteous man. And let it be as far from us to think that any one is truly just, unless he live by faith, *for the just shall live by faith.* And who of those who would be accounted Christians, unless it be the Pelagians, and amongst them perhaps thyself, Julian, only, will say that an infidel is just, will say that a wicked man is just, will say that a man enslaved to the Devil is just? Yea, though he were Fabricius, though he were Fabius, though he were Scipio, though he were Regulus, with whose names thou thinkest to terrify me, as if we were talking in the old Roman court." And elsewhere he tells us, [l]"All the life of unbelievers is sin, and there is nothing good without the chiefest good: for where the knowledge of the eternal and unchangeable truth is wanting, there is but false virtue even in the best manners." And again; [m]"The man is first to be changed, that his works may be changed; for if a man remain in that estate that he is evil, he cannot have good works."

---

[i] Τὸ παντάπασιν ἀδύνατον, καὶ ἀπαρέσκον Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπικίνδυνον τῷ τολμῶντι δεδήλωται· διόπερ παρακαλῶ, ὡς διδάσκει ὁ Κύριος, ποιήσωμεν τὸ δενδρὸν καλὸν, καὶ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ καλὸν, καὶ καθαρίσωμεν πρῶτον τὸ ἔντος τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, καὶ τότε τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ ἔσται καθαρὸν ὅλον· καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἀποστόλου παιδευθέντες, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, καὶ τότε ἐπιτελῶμεν ἁγιωσύνην ἐν ἀγάπῃ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα εὐάρεστοι Θεῷ, καὶ εὐπρόσδεκτοι τῷ Κυρίῳ γινώμεθα εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ibid.

[k] Sed absit ut sit in aliquo vera virtus, nisi fuerit justus: absit autem ut sit justus vere, nisi vivat ex fide, *justus enim ex fide vivit.* Quis porro eorum qui se pro Christianis haberi volunt, nisi soli Pelagiani, aut in ipsis etiam forte tu solus, justum dixerit infidelem; justum dixerit impium; justum dixerit diabolo mancipatum? Sit licet ille Fabricius; sit licet Fabius; sit licet Scipio; sit licet Regulus; quorum me nominibus, tanquam in antiqua Romana curia loqueremur, putasti esse terrendum. Aug. contra Julian. Pelag. l. 4. [17. vol. X.]

Hence is that of St. Hierome: [n]"Let us pronounce our sentence against those that do not believe in Christ, and yet think themselves valiant, wise, and temperate, and just, that they may know that there is none can live without Christ, without whom all virtue lies in vice." And therefore saith St. Bernard, [o]"What have you philosophers to do with virtues, who are ignorant of Christ the virtue of God?" And St. Gregory, [p]"If faith be not first begotten in our hearts, all the other things cannot be good, though they may seem good."

And so Prosper; [q]"Though there have been some who by their natural understanding have endeavoured to resist vices, yet they have barrenly adorned only the life of this time; but they could not attain to true virtues and everlasting happiness. For without the worship of the true God, even that which seems to be virtue is sin; neither can any one please God without God himself." And elsewhere: "And so it manifestly appears, that in the minds of wicked men there dwelleth no virtue, but that all their works are unclean and defiled, they having not spiritual but fleshly wisdom, not heavenly but earthly, not Christian but devilish, not from the Father of lights, but from the prince of darkness[r]." And therefore we may well conclude, that all the works of such as have not received grace from God to be converted to him are not pleasing unto God, but have the nature of sin.

---

[l] Omnis infidelium vita peccatum est, et nihil est bonum sine summo bono. Ubi enim deest agnitio æternæ et incommutabilis veritatis, falsa virtus est etiamsi in optimis moribus. Id. de vera innoc. c. 106. [vol. X. App.]

[m] Prius est mutandus homo ut opera mutentur. Si enim manet homo in eo quod malus est, bona opera habere non potest. Id. de verbis Dom. Serm. [72. 1. vol. V.]

[n] Sententiam proferamus adversus eos, qui in Christum non credentes, fortes, et sapientes, et temperantes se putant esse, et justos; ut sciant nullum absque Christo vivere, sine quo omnis virtus in vitio est. Hieron. in Gal. c. 3. [vol. VII. p. 433.]

[o] Quid vobis philosophis cum virtutibus, qui Dei virtutem Christum ignoratis? Bernard. Serm. in Cant. 22. [p. 814.]

[p] Si fides non prima in corde nostro gignitur, reliqua quæque bona esse non possunt, etiamsi bona videantur. Gregor. Moral. l. 2. [71.]

[q] Etsi fuit, qui naturali intellectu conatus sit vitiis reluctari, hujus tantum temporis vitam steriliter ornavit; ad veras autem virtutes æternamque beatitudinem non profecit. Sine cultu enim veri Dei, etiam quod virtus videtur esse peccatum est; nec placere ullus Deo sine Deo potest. Prosper. de vocat. gent. l. 1. c. 7.

---

[r] Et ita manifestissime patet, in impiorum animis nullam habitare virtutem, sed omnia opera eorum immunda esse atque polluta, habentium sapientiam non spiritualem sed animalem, non cælestem sed terrenam, non Christianam sed diabolicam, non a Patre luminum, sed a principe tenebrarum. Id. contra Collat. c. [28.]

ARTICLE XIV.

OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.

Voluntary works besides, over and above God's Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

ALTHOUGH (as we have seen in the eleventh article) both scripture, reason, and Fathers determine that we cannot merit any thing of ourselves from God, but that we are justified by Christ's merit imputed to us, not by any works performed by ourselves; yet there are a sort of people in the world that would persuade us, that we may not only merit for ourselves, [a] but do and suffer more than in justice can be here required of us; and what we thus do or suffer more than we are bound to, though it be superfluous as to ourselves, being abundantly supplied from our other good works, yet it is not superfluous as to others [b]: but whatsoever any one thus doth and suffereth more and above his duty, it is thrown into the common stock or treasury of the church, out of which such as lack may be supplied. And [c] out of this common treasury or magazine it is, that their church fetch all their indulgencies, which are indeed nothing else but the distributions [d] of the several satisfactions made by the supererogatory works of others to such as themselves see fit, viz. to such as will give the most money for them. If I commit a great sin, for which I must do great penance, this penance can by no means be pardoned or remitted to me, unless I make complete satisfaction for the sin committed some other ways. Now seeing there are several in the world (as they pretend) that have performed more works, and suffered more penances and more punishments than were due [to] their own sins, if I will sue out for them, these supererogatory works and sufferings, undergone and performed by them, may be granted out to me; and so I being looked upon as undergoing this penance in others, am freed from it in myself. They have done more than was required, I am loath to do as much as is required; and therefore what they have done more than is required of them, I buy, to satisfy for what I do less than is required of me. And so my defect is cured by their excess.

---

[a] Asserimus non paucos sanctos homines multo plura propter Deum et justitiam esse perpessos, quam exigeret reatus pœnæ temporalis, cui fuerunt obnoxii propter culpas ab ipsis commissas. Bellarm.

[b] Haud dubito quin quod in ærumnarum quas tolerarunt cruciatibus erat satisfactorium, non evanuerit penitus in aera. Nam Deus ipse benignissimus, qui mala nostra semper vertit in bonum, non patitur hanc satisfactionem omnino perire; sed in aliquam haud dubie convertet utilitatem. At peribit sane si nec eis neque cæteris profuerit quicquam. Et quoniam illi suæ satisfactionis fructum nullis destinarunt personis certis, ideo fit ut in commune cesserit ecclesiæ totius emolumentum, et communis ecclesiæ thesaurus jam dicatur, nimirum, ut inde rependatur quicquid cæteris ex justa satisfactione defuerit. [Fischer. episc.] Roffens. Artic. 17. [Assert. Luther. confut. p. 491.]

---

[c] Ecclesia de hoc thesauro potest communicare alicui vel aliquibus pro eorum peccatis in parte vel in toto, secundum quod placet ecclesiæ de hoc thesauro plus vel minus communicare. Durand. Hunc thesaurum per beatum Petrum cæli clavigerum, ejusque successores, suos in terris vicarios, commisit (Christus) fidelibus salubriter dispensandum; et propriis et rationabilibus causis nunc pro totali, nunc pro partiali remissione pœnæ temporalis pro peccatis debitæ, tam generaliter quam specialiter, prout cum Deo expedire cognoscerent, misericorditer applicandum. Clem. Sext. in confirmat. jubilei. [Raynaldi Contin. Annal. Baronii, vol. VI. p. 487.]

[d] For thus we find Gregorius de Valentia [de indulg. c. 1.] describing an indulgence: “Indulgentia ecclesiastica est relaxatio pœnæ temporalis, judicio divino peccatis actualibus post remissam culpam debitæ, per applicationem superabundantium Christi et sanctorum satisfactionum, facta extra sacramentum ab eo, qui legitimam ad hoc autoritatem habet. So that it is the superabundant works of the saints as well as Christ, that are the subject matter of indulgences, by the application whereof the punishment due to actual sins is taken away. And therefore must the works of saints also help to fill up this treasure. Indeed there were some of them that denied any of the merits or satisfactions of saints to be thrown into the treasury with Christ's, as Franciscus Maronis, Angelus de Clavasio, and others. But Bellarmine tells us, Communis aliorum theologorum, tum antiquorum, ut S. Thomæ, et S. Bonaventuræ, tum recentiorum omnium sententia, thesaurum satisfactionum tum Christi tum sanctorum semper agnovit. Bellarm. de indulg. [vol. III. lib. I. c. 2.

Now this article is composed to awake us out of these profitable and pleasant but sinful dreams, assuring us, that all such *works besides, over and above God's commands, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety*, it being both an arrogant, proud, and impious thing for any one to say he can do more than God commands, and so be able to satisfy for others as well as for himself. So that whosoever saith he can do more than God's laws require, or suffer more than his own sins deserve, is a proud and a wicked person: it being a great sin and wickedness in any to broach or abet such doctrines as plainly appear to be erroneous both from scripture, reason, and Fathers.

And as for the scriptures, what more pregnant and convincing proof can be alleged by us, or expected by any, than what is expressed in this article itself, even that saying of our Saviour, *So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are* [c] *unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do?* Luke xvii. 10. If whatsoever commands we perform, it is but still our duty to perform them, how is it possible we should do more than is our duty to do? as considering, that whatsoever we do, it is God's command we should do it. Do I pray without ceasing? I do no more than what I am commanded, 1 Thess. v. 17. Do I in every thing give thanks? it is no more than what I am commanded, ver. 18. Do I sell all I have, and distribute to the poor? it is no more than what I am commanded, Luke xviii. 22. Do I deny myself, take up my cross, and follow Christ? it is no more than what I am commanded, Matt. xvi. 24. Yea, am I faithful unto death? it is no more than what I am commanded, Rev. ii. 10. Thus can there no good thing be performed by me but what is commanded by God; and if it be God's will to command it, it is my duty to perform it. And hence it is, that in the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, he that came in at the last hour had his penny as well as he that came in at the first, Matt. xx. 9, 10: plainly shewing us, that they that had borne the heat of the day, the heat of temptations, the heat of afflictions, the heat of persecutions, yet had not done any more than what it was their duty to do; they were still unprofitable servants, and had deserved no more than they that coming not in till the last hour underwent none of these, and that was nothing at all.

---

[c] Δούλῳ γὰρ ἀνάγκη ἐπίκειται τὸ πληροῦν τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Κυρίου, οὐ μὴν ὡς κατόρθωμα ἐπιγράφεσθαι ἑαυτῷ τοῦτο ὀφείλει· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐργάσηται πληγῶν ἀξιωτέος· ἐπεὶ δὲ εἰργάσατο, ἀρκείσθω ὅτι τὰς πληγὰς ἐξέφυγεν· οὐ μὴν ὀφείλει ἐπὶ τούτῳ τιμὴν ζητεῖν ἀναγκαίως. Theophyl. in Luc. 17. [p. 466.]

But we need not heap up arguments in so plain a truth: for how is it possible that any one should do more good works than are commanded, when nothing is a good work but what is commanded, nay, and therefore only, because it is commanded, it is a good work? It is God's command that is the ground of all duty. And what is the ground of duty to me, is the ground of acceptance with him. And therefore is there nothing that God will accept as good from me, but what himself hath commanded to me. These voluntary works therefore, which they call works of supererogation, are they commanded by God or not? If they be commanded, it is my duty to perform them, and so they are not supererogatory; and I should sin if I do not do them: if they be not commanded, it is my duty not to perform them; and so I should sin if I do them. How then shall I do more good works than it is my duty to do, seeing what it is not my duty to do cannot be any good work? We may see this evidently in the Jews, in their over-multiplied fasts and uncommanded sacrifices, which they might have accounted as so many works of supererogation, wherein they thought they did God good service: yet what saith he? *Who hath required these things at your hands?* Isa. i. 12. And thus doth he say of all works, besides and above his commands, *Who hath required these at your hands?* As if he should say, I never commanded these things to you, and therefore will never accept of them from you. And thus are all these works of supererogation not good and accepted, because not commanded works; and therefore it is impossible that any more good works should be performed by us than what is commanded, seeing nothing that is not commanded can be a good work.

But I would willingly know what necessity there is of such works of supererogation? Are they necessary for the satisfaction for their own sins? No; for then they are not works of supererogation: what need therefore is there of them? Are they needful for the satisfying for other men's sins? I know the great maintainers[f] of this opinion, being loath to say these works are altogether superfluous, adjudge them necessary for others, though not for themselves who do perform them, making them copartners with Christ, in making satisfaction for the sins of others. But what is this but blasphemously to debase the merits of Christ to exalt their own, and to make the good works (I might say the sins) of finite creatures to be of the like value with the blood of the Son of God?

But I would wish all such but seriously to consider with themselves, whether they think in their consciences that one mere man may satisfy for another's sins, or whether at the day of judgment what one man hath done shall be rewarded in another? I am sure the apostle tells us, *We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or evil*, 2 Cor. v. 10: and, *Every man shall bear his own burden*, Gal. vi. 5: and, *Every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour*, 1 Cor. iii. 8: so that the father shall not there be punished for the son's iniquity, nor the son rewarded for the father's piety; but every one shall stand upon his own legs; [g] in the same condition he died before, he must now be judged. And if so, what will become of the works of supererogation? What need is there that any one should perform them, seeing himself stands not in need of them, neither can any one else receive any profit from them, by having satisfaction made for their sins by them? But as he that lives and dies in holiness shall not be prejudiced by other men's sins: so he that lives and dies in sins shall not be any way profited by other men's holiness. Though there have been many that have done and suffered much for the sake of Christ, yea, unto death itself; yet it is not the torments of their death that can satisfy for the sins of another's life. No, it is Christ, and Christ [h] alone, we are to expect this satisfaction from. What he did, he did of merit, not of duty; but what all others do, they do of duty, not of merit. Themselves were bound to it, and therefore they cannot advantage others by it.

---

[f] Let us hear one of their own rabbies. Hæc satisfactio redundans quorsum evadit? Quum mortuus est Christus, et præter Christum cum Maria Virgo, et Petrus, et Paulus, et innumeri præterea alii sancti mortem obierunt, tot operibus redundantis satisfactionis cumulati, quandoquidem illa non intulerunt in cælum ubi nullus est satisfaciendi locus, opera illa quonam abierunt? &c. Si egomet, auditores, dicerem abjici et supervacaneum esse (opus illud supererogatorium) vererer ne me lapidibus obruendum censeretis. Et merito quidem: nam nulla ratione dicendum est, quicquam in ecclesia Dei vel deesse vel supervacaneum esse. Et sane impium esset si quis crederet rem tam puram tantamque, quanta est satisfactio pro peccatis, vento dissipari et evanescere. Quis igitur eorum operum est usus? O admirabilem Dei providentiam! Ex iis conflatur communio illa sanctorum. Panigorol. [Discept. Calvin. p. 275.] So that it seems, according to him, these works of supererogation, though they do him that performed them no good, yet others get much benefit from them, as well as from the satisfactions wrought by Christ.

[g] In quo quemque invenerit suus

And if they will not believe us, let them hearken to the Fathers. St. Basil saith, [i] "For no man is able to persuade the Devil to let go one out of his power, whom he hath once gotten into it. And he that cannot make satisfaction, or propitiate God for his own sins, how can he do it for another?" The like to which I find in the Commentary upon St. Matthew, ascribed to St. Chrysostome: [k] "If therefore the glory that is

---

novissimus dies, in hoc eum comprehendet mundi novissimus dies: quoniam qualis in die isto quisque moritur, talis in illo judicabitur. August. Epist. [199. 2. vol. II.] Tunc cuique veniet dies ille cum venerit ei dies, ut talis hinc exeat, qualis judicandus est illo die. Ac per hoc vigilare debet omnis Christianus, ne imparatum eum inveniat Domini adventus. Imparatum autem inveniet ille dies, quem imparatum invenerit suæ vitæ hujus ultimus dies. Ibid. [3.]

[h] Quod de uno solo mediatore Dei et hominum, homine Christo Jesu, catholica fides novit, quod pro nobis mortem, hoc est peccati pœnam, sine peccato subire dignatus est. Sicut enim solus ideo factus est hominis filius ut nos per illum Dei filii fieremus; ita solus pro nobis suscepit sine malis meritis pœnam, ut nos per illum sine bonis meritis consequeremur gratiam. Aug. contra duas epist. Pelag. l. 4. [6. vol. X.]

[i] Ἄνθρωπος γὰρ οὐδεὶς δυνατός ἐστι πεῖσαι τὸν διάβολον πρὸς τὸ τὸν ἅπαξ αὐτῷ ὑποπεσόντα ἐξελέσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξουσίας· ὅς γε οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτημάτων, οἷός τε ἐστὶ ἐξίλασμα δοῦναι τῷ Θεῷ, πῶς οὖν ἰσχύσει τοῦτο ὑπὲρ ἑτέρου πρᾶξαι: Basil. in Psal. 48. [vol. I. p. 239.]

[k] Si ergo major est gloria quæ præparata est sanctis a Deo, quam quod unusquisque sanctorum meretur, quomodo sufficiat et aliis ad salutem uniuscujusque opus eorum, cum nec sibi soli sufficiat ad gloriam illam justo judicio consequendam? Opus imperfect. in Mat. hom. 52. [vol. VII. p. 967. ed. *Par.*]

prepared for the saints by God be greater than every one of the saints deserve, how can their work suffice others also for their salvation, when it is not sufficient for themselves for the attainment of that glory by just judgment?" Clearly implying that the saints cannot do as much as they ought to do for themselves; and then how can they do any thing for others?

To the same purpose also speaks Leo: [l] "Though the death of many of his saints be precious in the sight of God, yet the death of any of these innocent persons was not the propitiation of the world. The righteous persons do receive crowns, not give them. And from the courage of the faithful examples of patience do arise, not the gifts of righteousness. For the death of them all were single deaths, neither did any of them pay another man's debts by his end: seeing amongst the children of men there is none but the Lord Jesus Christ only in whom all are crucified, all dead, all buried, all are raised up at the last day." So that there is no righteousness or satisfaction to be had from the actions and passions of any, but only Christ.

And so St. Augustine: [m] "Neither is this so spoken, as if we could be equal to the Lord Christ, if we suffer martyrdom for him even unto blood. For he had power to lay down his life, and he had power to take it up again: but we neither live as long as we would, and die although we would not, &c. Lastly, brethren may die for brethren, yet the blood of any martyr is not poured out for the forgiveness and remission of their brethren's sins as he did for us." What could be spoken more fully to the purpose? Our adversaries say that many of the saints, especially the martyrs, do and suffer more than they need, and what they do and suffer over and above God's command, (as martyrdom in particular,) is set upon others' scores, and applied to some of their brethren for the remission of their sins. But St. Augustine saith, There is no martyr but Christ suffereth death for the pardon of another's sins.

---

[l] Quamvis multorum sanctorum in conspectu Domini pretiosa mors fuerit, nullius tamen insontis occisio propitiatio fuit mundi. Acceperunt justi, non dederunt coronas, et de fortitudine fidelium nata sunt exempla patientiæ, non dona justitiæ. Singulares quippe in singulis mortes fuerunt, nec alterius quisquam debitum suo fine persolvit. Cum inter filios hominum unus solus Dominus noster Jesus Christus extiterit, in quo omnes crucifixi, omnes mortui, omnes sepulti, omnes sunt etiam suscitati. Leo Epist. [97. c. 4.] ad Palæstin. et Serm. 12. de passione.

[m] Neque hoc ita dictum est quasi propterea Domino Christo pares esse possimus, si pro illo usque ad sanguinem martyrium duxerimus. Ille potestatem habuit ponendi animam suam et iterum sumendi eam. Nos autem nec quantum volumus vivimus, et morimur etiamsi nolumus, &c. Postremo, etsi fratres pro fratribus moriantur, tamen in fraternorum peccatorum remissionem nullius sanguis martyris funditur, quod fecit ille pro nobis. Aug. in Joh. tract. 84. [2. vol. III.]

In so clear a case it may suffice to produce one more witness, and that is St. Hilary, who, speaking of the Ten Virgins, five wise and five foolish, when the foolish came to the wise to borrow some of their oil; [n]"To whom," saith he, "they answered, that they could not give them any, lest by chance there might not be enough for all; to wit, that no one can be helped by another's works and merits, because it is necessary that every one buy oil for his own lamp;" and therefore can none have any oil, any grace, any works to spare over and above what himself needs, whereby the necessities of others may be supplied. So express are the Fathers in delivering the impossibility of one man's sins being satisfied for by another's sufferings, and of one man's being supplied from another's merits. And that there is none that do more than is required, the Fathers clearly avouch, in saying, there is none can do so much as is required of him. For they shew how there is none lives without sin. And if they do not live without sin, they do not do as much as is required of them, for they do not avoid sin as they are commanded. And if they do not do as much as is required of them, certainly they cannot be said to do more than is commanded to them. Now that the Fathers do thus say, that there is no mere man without sin, we shall see in the next article: in the meanwhile concluding from the premises, that *works of supererogation cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety.*

---

[n] Quibus responderunt non posse se dare, quia non sit forte quod omnibus satis sit. Alienis scilicet operibus ac meritis neminem adjuvandum: quia unicuique lampadi suæ emere oleum sit necesse. Hilar. in Mat. cap. 27. [5.]

ARTICLE XV.

OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN.

Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things (sin only excepted) from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to be a Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin, as St. John saith, was not in him. But all we the rest, though baptized and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

WHEN the Son of God became the Son of man, he so became the Son of man as still to remain the Son of God. He did not lay aside his Divine nature to assume the human; but he assumed the human nature into the Divine, not as it was corrupted by sin, but as it was at first created by God. For as it was corrupted by sin, it was corrupted with the worst of evils, and therefore, as such, both unworthy and uncapable of being united to God, the best of goods. Who therefore assuming the human nature into the unity of his Divine Person, assumed only what was [a] worthy and capable of such assumption, to wit, the perfect nature of man as it was in its first creation, not as it was in its sinful corruption. And so he that was perfectly God as well as perfectly man, was a perfect man also as well as a perfect God. Because it was the perfect nature of man which he assumed from his mother in time, as it was the perfect nature of God which he received of his Father from eternity. And therefore as he in the truth of the Divine nature was begotten like unto the Father in all things, his personal properties only excepted; so in the truth of the human nature he was made like unto us in all things, our sinful infirmities only excepted. He was in all things but sin like unto us; but in sin he was altogether unlike us. For we both in flesh and spirit are naturally full of sin, but [b] he was clearly void of sin both in his flesh and spirit. For he came to be a Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of himself once made should take away the sins of the world: whereas had he been guilty of sin in himself, he could never have taken it away from us. *For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needed not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins, and then for the people's.* Heb. vii. 26, 27. And such a one was Christ; for *in him*, saith St. John, *is no sin*, 1 John iii. 5. Indeed sin doth not reign in the saints his members; but sin did not so much as dwell in him the Head. And as sin did not live in him, so neither did he live in sin; for he *did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth*, 1 Pet. ii. 22. Isa. liii. 9. And therefore doth himself say, *Which of you convinceth me of sin?* John viii. 46: and thus was he as clear from sin in his human nature as in his divine. As God, he was infinitely contrary unto sin; and as man, he was perfectly void of it: yea he was therefore as man perfectly void of sin, because as God he was infinitely contrary to it; it being impossible that such things as are infinitely contrary to one another should be ever united together.

---

[a] Ὁ δὲ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ὁ δι' ἑαυτοῦ συνάπτων τῷ Θεῷ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ἐκεῖνο συνάπτει μόνον ὅπερ ἂν τῆς πρὸς Θεὸν συμφυΐας ἄξιον ᾖ· ὥσπερ οὖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἄνθρωπον τῇ δυνάμει τῆς θεότητος ἑαυτῷ προσῳκείωσε μέρος μὲν τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως ὄντα, οὐ μὴν τοῖς πάθεσιν ὑποπεπτωκότα τῆς φύσεως τοῖς εἰς ἁμαρτίαν ἐκκαλουμένοις, ἁμαρτίαν γὰρ, φησὶν, οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. Greg. Nyssen. de perfecta Christi forma. [p. 292. vol. III.]

---

[b] Ἔοικεν ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν τῷ Πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ οὗπερ ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς ἀναμάρτητος, ἀνεπίληπτος, καὶ ἀπαθὴς τὴν ψυχήν· Θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπου σχήματι ἄχραντος, πατρικῷ θελήματι διάκονος, Λόγος Θεὸς, ὁ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, ὁ ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς, σὺν καὶ τῷ σχήματι Θεός οὗτος ἡμῖν εἰκὼν, ἀκηλίδωτος. Clem. Alex. Pædag. l. 1. c. 2. Πῶς οὖν ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν βεβίωκε; καὶ πῶς πεπολίτευται; ἁμαρτίαν μὲν οὐκ ἐποίησε, πῶς γὰρ ἂν ἡ δικαιοσύνη τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἡττήθη; Basil. [vol. II. p. 762.] de constitut. monast. c. 4. In hoc ergo ille homo qui natus ex virgine est, magna cunctis qui ex utriusque sexus commixtione producimur distantia segregatur: quod cum omnes non similitudinem sed veritatem peccati in carne gestemus, ille non veritatem sed similitudinem peccati in veræ carnis assumptione susceperit. Cassian. Collat. l. 22. c. [12.]

But though Christ was thus perfectly void of sin, yet there is no other man or [c] woman that ever did or ever shall live upon the face of earth, but is both defiled with it and guilty of it. Nay, though we be baptized, and our original sin be washed from us, and though born again too, and so our actual sins subdued under us; yet for all this will sin dwell in us, and we shall be guilty of sin. So that there was never any mere man but who was a sinful man. And if any one saith he is no sinner, he sins in saying so; for [d] *if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us,* 1 John i. 8; yea, and *if we say we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us,* ver. 10.

---

[c] No, not the Virgin Mary herself, (who is the principal person excepted by our adversaries; but,) we have no reason to except her, or rather we have reason not to except her, considering how there is none of the Fathers that except her, (nor any one else do they except but only Christ.) Nay, they acknowledge her in particular to be a sinner, one born in sin. Et quid incoinquinatius illo utero virginis, cujus caro etiamsi de peccati propagatione venit, non tamen de peccati propagine concepit. Aug. de Gen. ad literam, l. 10. [32. vol. III.] Proinde corpus Christi quamvis ex carne fœminæ assumptum est, quæ de illa carnis peccati propagine concepta fuerat, tamen quia non sic in ea conceptum est quomodo fuerat illa concepta, nec ipsa erat caro peccati sed similitudo carnis peccati. Ibid. Nam licet ipsa hominis ejusdem conceptio sit munda, et absque carnalis delectationis peccato, virgo tamen ipsa, unde assumptus est, est in iniquitatibus concepta, et in peccatis concepit eam mater ejus, et cum originali peccato nata est, quia et ipsa in Adam peccavit, in quo omnes peccaverunt. Anselm. *Cur Deus homo*, &c. l. 2. c. 16. [p. 110.] And therefore saith Damascen, Μετὰ τὴν συγκατάθεσιν τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπῆλθεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν, καθαῖρον αὐτήν. Damasc. Orthodox. fid. l. 3. c. 2. And if the Holy Ghost purged her, it seems before she was unclean. And besides this, the Fathers accuse her also of several actual sins, as of an unseasonable request at the feast when our Saviour turned the water into wine. John ii. 3. Propter hoc properante Maria ad admirabile vini signum, et ante tempus volente participare compendii poculo, Dominus repellens ejus intempestivam festinationem dixit, *Quid mihi et tibi est mulier?* Iren. advers. hær. l. 3. [16. 7.] Indeed our Saviour's answer to her doth itself imply as much, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ γύναι; οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου, that is, not *What is that to me and thee?* but, as the Ethiopic renders it, ምንት፡ ቢየ፡ ምስሌኪ፡ i. e. Quid mihi tecum, *What have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come*, as our translation hath it. Where Athanasius observes, that he reproved his mother, ἐπέπληττε τῇ μητρί. Contra Arrian. Orat. 4. And St. Chrysostome, ἐπετίμησεν ἀκαίρως αἰτούσῃ, in Mat. hom. 45. and certainly not without cause, as Theophylact saith, Ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμᾷ αὐτῇ οὐκ ἀλόγως. And if he had cause to reprove her, (as certainly he had, or else he would never have done it,) she must needs have done something she ought not to have done. Nay, and they accuse her of vainglory too in the same act, desiring him to turn water into wine, that the people might the more honour her, the mother of such a son; Ἐβούλετο γὰρ καὶ ἐκείνοις καταθέσθαι χάριν, καὶ ἑαυτὴν λαμπροτέραν ποιῆσαι διὰ τοῦ παιδός. Chrysost. in Joh. hom. 21. [p. 639. vol. II.] And to shew her power and authority over him that could do such things, Οὐδέπω γὰρ ἣν ἐχρῆν περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξαν εἶχον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπειδὴ ὤδινεν αὐτὸν, ἠξίου κατὰ τὴν λοιπὴν τῶν μητέρων συνήθειαν, οὕτως ἅπαντα ἐπιτάττειν αὐτῷ, δέον ὡς δεσπότην σέβειν καὶ προσκυνεῖν. Ibid. Agnoscat et ejus adolescentiam, videat multa et magna miracula, conversionem aquarum in vinum; in quo primo miraculo temptavit illa fœmina jubere se filio posse tanquam mater, domina, quæ se agnoscebat ancillam, *Fili*, ait, *defecit illis vinum*, &c. Aug. de symb.

But besides these, there be several other places of scripture which deliver this truth unto us, that there is sin even in the best of us. For *the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe,* Gal. iii. 22. *For we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin,* Rom. iii. 9. *As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all*

---

ad catech. [I. 14. p. 562. vol. VI.] In hoc autem miraculo *quid mihi et tibi?* Non enim hoc processit ex te, sed in eo qui fecit te. Non competit tibi ut jubeas Deo, competit autem ut subdita sis Deo. Ibid. Plainly shewing, that she took more upon her than she should, in speaking to him to work miracles. And the same faults they lay to her charge for coming to call him away when he was teaching the people, Mark iii. 31. Ὅρα καὶ τῆς καὶ ἐκείνων τὴν ἀπόνοιαν. δέον γὰρ εἰσελθόντας ἀκοῦσαι μετὰ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἢ μὴ τοῦτο βουλομένους ἀναμεῖναι καταλῦσαι τὸν λόγον, καὶ τότε προσελθεῖν· οἱ δὲ ἔξω καλοῦσιν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων τοῦτο ποιοῦσι, φιλοτιμίαν περιδεικνύμενοι περιττὴν, καὶ δεῖξαι θέλοντες, ὅτι μετὰ πολλῆς αὐτῷ ἐπιτάττουσι τῆς ἐξουσίας. Chrysost. in Mat. hom. 44. [p. 287. vol. II.] Ἀνθρώπινόν τι ἐβούλετο ἐνδείξασθαι ἡ μήτηρ, ὅτι ἐξουσιάζει τοῦ παιδός· οὐδὲν γὰρ μέγα οὔπω περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐνόει· διὰ τοῦτο οὖν καὶ ἔτι λαλοῦντα βούλεται πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἐπισπάσασθαι· φιλοτιμουμένη ὡς ὑποταττομένου αὐτῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ. Theophylact. in Mat. 12. [ad fin.] But they blame her (and that worthily) the most for calling him then from doing good, which certainly she ought not to have done. Quia tunc multitudinem docebat, nec æquum erat ut hos relinqueret et ad matrem et fratres procurreret. Euthym. in Matt. 12. [p. 80.] Ἐννόησον γὰρ οἷον ἦν, πάντος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ δήμου περιεστῶτος αὐτὸν, καὶ τοῦ πλήθους τῆς ἀκροάσεως ἐκκρεμαμένου, καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας προτεθείσης, ἐκείνην παρελθοῦσαν μέσην ἀπαγαγεῖν μὲν αὐτὸν τῆς παραινέσεως, ἰδίᾳ δὲ διαλέγεσθαι, καὶ μηδὲ ἔνδον ἀνέχεσθαι ἐλθεῖν, ἀλλ' ἕλκειν αὐτὸν ἔξω μόνον πρὸς ἑαυτήν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔλεγε, τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου; Chrysost. in Joh. hom. 21. [p. 639. vol. II.]

[d] Item placuit quod ait S. Johannes apostolus, Si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus nos ipsos seducimus et veritas in nobis non est, quisquis sic accipiendum putaverit, ut dicat, propter humilitatem oportere dici, nos habere peccatum, non quia veritas est, anathema sit. Concil. Milevit. 2. can. 6. [p. 1218. vol. I.]

gone out of the way, they are altogether become unprofitable; there is none that doth good, no, not one, ver. 10, 11. Psalm xiv. 1, 2, 3. For *as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned*, Rom. v. 12. *For there is no man that sinneth not*, 1 Reg. viii. 46. 2 Chron. vi. 36. Nay, *There is not a just man upon earth, that doth good, and sinneth not*, Eccles. vii. 20. *For in many things we offend all*, Jac. iii. 2. *Who* therefore *can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from sin?* Prov. xx. 9. *O enter not* then *into judgment with thy servant, O Lord: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified*, Psalm cxliii. 2.

And as the scripture doth thus assert, that all the men and women that ever lived upon the face of the earth, (Christ only excepted, who was God as well as man,) were sinners; so reason itself, if consulted aright, cannot but determine the same. Which any one may easily perceive that doth but consider how (as we have seen more fully in the ninth article) in Adam the whole human nature was corrupted, all sinning and being made sinners in him: for in him God said to all, *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die the death.* What death? Certainly the death of the soul as well as the body; spiritual, consisting in the separation of the soul from God, as well as temporal death, that consisteth in the separation of the body from the soul. And so in Adam our souls were made sinful by the loss of God, as our bodies are made mortal by the loss of their souls [e]: sin passing from that one man into the souls, as well as death into the bodies of all mankind. And therefore it is impossible that any particular person should be excepted from sin, seeing the whole nature is defiled with it: so that he must be no mere man that is no sinner. And therefore it is that our Saviour commanded all his disciples, his apostles, all his followers, to pray daily, [f] *Forgive us our*

---

[e] Si quis soli Adæ prævaricationem suam, non et ejus propagini asserit nocuisse, aut certe mortem tantum corporis quæ pœna peccati est, non autem et peccatum quod mors est animæ, per unum hominem in omne genus humanum transisse testatur, injustitiam Deo dabit contradicens apostolo. Concil. Arausic. 2. can. 2. [vol. II.]

[f] Item placuit ut quicunque dixerit in oratione Dominica, ideo dicere sanctos, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*, ut non pro seipsis hoc dicatur, quia non est eis jam necessaria ista petitio, sed pro aliis qui sunt in suo populo peccatores, et ideo non dicere unumquemque sanctorum, *Dimitte mihi*

trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us, Luke xi. 4: because from the fountain of sin in our hearts the streams of sin are continually flowing out in our lives, which we have need to beg daily of God to pardon, and forgive to us, to all of us.

And to this we may also take notice, how even the best of saints whilst on earth are but imperfect saints, their graces imperfect, their duties imperfect, their love imperfect, their charity imperfect, all imperfect. Which imperfection and defect in all their graces and duties, as it cannot be any more, so it is not any less than [g] sin, forasmuch as holiness is the exact conformity of the will of man to the will of God, and of the life of man to the laws of God; and how far soever any one lacks of the exactness of that conformity, so much he lacks of holiness; and how much he lacks of holiness, so much he hath of sin. And therefore so far as grace and duty is imperfect in us, so far is sin and iniquity to be acknowledged by us. Now that our graces and duties are imperfect upon earth, is plain, in that to have our graces and duties perfect, is to be in heaven; perfection of grace being itself the crown of glory. And therefore, though there be many that have sin without grace, there is none that hath grace without sin in this world. But as the [h] Fathers long ago acknowledged, and

---

debita mea, sed *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*, ut hoc pro aliis potius quam pro se justus petere intelligatur, anathema sit. Sanctus enim et justus erat apostolus Jacobus cum dicebat, *In multis enim offendimus omnes.* Concil. Milevit. 2. can. 7. [vol. I.] Item placuit ut quicumque verba ipsa Dominicæ orationis ubi dicimus, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*, ita volunt a sanctis dici ut humiliter non veraciter hoc dicatur, anathema sit. Ibid. can. 8.

[g] Virtus est charitas qua id quod diligendum est diligitur. Hæc in aliis major, in aliis minor, in aliis nulla est; plenissima vero quæ jam non potest augeri quamdiu hic homo vivit, est in nemine; quod autem augeri potest profecto illud quod minus est quam debet, ex vitio est. Aug. Epist. [167. 15. vol. II.] ad Hieronymum. Peccatum est cum vel non est charitas, vel minor est quam debet. Id. de perfect. justitiæ. [15. vol. X.]

[h] Ut enim sæpe diximus, omnis humana justitia injustitia esse convincitur, si districte judicetur. Greg. Moral. l. 9. [28. vol. I.] Nostra si qua est humilis justitia, recta forsan sed non pura, nisi forte meliores nos esse credimus quam patres nostros, qui non minus veraciter quam humiliter dicebant, omnes justitiæ nostræ tanquam pannus menstruatæ mulieris. Quomodo enim pura justitia ubi non potest adhuc culpa deesse? Bernard. de verbis Esai. serm. 5. [p. 405.] Ex quo factum est virtutem quæ nunc est in homine justo perfectam hactenus nominari, ut ad ejus perfectionem pertineat etiam ipsius imperfectionis et in veritate

as we all do daily experience, our graces and duties are all imperfect, and so far as they are imperfect they must needs be sinful; not as if the imperfect graces or duties themselves were sinful graces and duties, but only the imperfections of those graces and duties are all sinful imperfections, which must be through Christ forgiven to us, before any duty can be accepted from us. And therefore, not only the worst of sinners, but even the best of saints must still acknowledge, that whilst on earth he hath sin as well as grace, and must never expect till he comes to heaven to have grace without sin. No, there is none but Christ that ever on earth was so holy as not to be sinful: all others are sinful as well as holy, if not sinful only and not holy.

And if we consult the Fathers, this was their settled judgment too, that all mortals are sinners, except Christ. Justin Martyr calls him, [i] "That only unreprovable just man." And Clemens Alexandrinus saith, [k] "But he (Christ) was altogether free from human passions. And therefore is he alone judge, because he is alone without sin. But we, by what strength we have, strive to avoid the least sins." And again, [l] "The Word alone is without sin, for to sin is natural and common to all." Whence Gregory Nazianzen: [m] "Not to sin at all, God hath ordained it (as a privilege) above the human nature." And St. Ambrose, [n] "In that thou confessest thou offendest, in this thou hast common fellowship with all, for none is without sin; to deny this is sacrilege." [o] "For who can glory, saith St. Hilary, "that he hath a

---

agnitio, et in humilitate confessio. Tunc enim est secundum hanc infirmitatem pro suo modulo perfecta ista parva justitia, quando etiam quid sibi desit intelligit. Aug. contra duas epist Pelag. l. 3. [19. vol. X.] V. et Salon. in Proverb.

[i] *Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ σταυρῶσαι ὑμᾶς ἐκεῖνον τὸν μόνον ἄμωμον καὶ δίκαιον ἄνθρωπον.* Just. Dialog. cum Tryph. [17.]

[k] *Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἀπόλυτος εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ἀνθρωπίνων παθῶν· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ μόνος κριτὴς, ὅτι ἀναμάρτητος μόνος· ἡμεῖς δὲ, ὅση δύναμις, ὡς ὅτι ἐλάχιστα ἁμαρτάνειν πειρώμεθα.* Clem. Alex. Pædagog. l. 1. c. 2.

[l] *Μόνος γὰρ ἀναμάρτητος ὁ Λόγος· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐξαμαρτάνειν πᾶσιν ἔμφυτον καὶ κοινόν.* Ibid. l. 3. c. ult. [p. 307.]

[m] Τὸ *παντελῶς ἀναμάρτητον ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν ἔταξεν ὁ Θεός.* Nazian. homil. in Jul. 4. [p. 128. vol. I.]

[n] Quod lapsum fateris, in eo tibi cum omnibus commune consortium: quia nemo sine peccato. Negare hoc sacrilegium. Ambros. in Ps. 118. [p. 1254. vol. I.]

[o] Quis enim gloriabitur castum se habere cor coram Deo, nec si

chaste heart before God? nay, though he be an infant of one day old, seeing, according to the apostle, both the origin and law of sin remaineth in us."

Gregory Nyssen also tells us: [p] "Wherefore to have nothing of what our adversary possesseth is the privilege of the Lord alone, who was partaker with us of his passions, yet without sin." And Theodorus Abucara: [q] "But there is none but Christ alone who was ever perfectly and altogether free from tasting of sin. But every sin, be it what it will, brings forth death."

Cyril of Alexandria to the same purpose: [r] "Christ was the first and the only man upon earth that did not commit sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." And Cassianus very sharply: [s] "This thing therefore, viz. to be without sin, which is singular and proper to Christ alone, he will with the fault of blasphemous pride challenge to himself an equality in, whosoever dare profess himself to be without sin; for then it will follow that he must say, that he hath the likeness of sinful flesh only, and not the truth of sin."

St. Augustine hath also delivered his opinion in this case very plainly. [t] "Perhaps," saith he, "it is not without cause, that when we often find in scripture that men are said to be without complaint, we can find none said to be without sin, but that one alone of whom it is openly said, *him who did not know sin.*" And elsewhere he propounds this question,

---

unius diei fuerit infans, manente in nobis etiam secundum apostolum et origine et lege peccati? Hilar. in Ps. lviii. [4. p. 129.]

[p] *Διὸ τὸ μηδὲν ἐσχηκέναι τῶν τοῦ ἀντικειμένου κτημάτων, μόνου τοῦ Κυρίου ἐστὶ, τοῦ μετασχόντος ἡμῖν τῶν αὐτοῦ παθημάτων χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.* Greg. Nyssen. in Ecclesiast. [p. 444. vol. I.]

[q] *Ἄκρως δὲ καὶ παράπαν ἁμαρτίας ἄγευστος οὐδεὶς εἰ μὴ ὁ Χριστός· πᾶσα δὲ ἁμαρτία καὶ ἡ τυχοῦσα θάνατον ἐπιφέρεται.* Theod. Abucara de 5 inimicis. [init.]

[r] *Πρῶτος καὶ μόνος ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ γῆς ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἁμαρτίαν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.* Cyril. Alex. de recta fide, ad Theodosium. [p. 18. par. ii. vol. V.]

[s] Hujus ergo rei, quæ illi tantum singularis ac propria est, æqualitatem sibi blasphemiæ superbiæ crimine vindicabit, quisquis se esse sine peccato ausus fuerit profiteri. Consequens enim est, ut similitudinem carnis peccati, et non veritatem peccati habere se dicat. Cassian. Collat. 22. c. 12.

[t] Non fortasse sine causa cum aliquoties in scripturis inveniatur, homines dictos esse sine querela, non invenitur qui sit dictus sine peccato, nisi unus solus de quo aperte dictum est, *eum qui non noverat peccatum.* Aug. de nat. et grat. [15. vol. X.]

[u] "Whether not only there is some of the children of men, but whether there could ever have been any heretofore, or can any be hereafter, who never had or never will have any sin at all?" And he answers immediately, "It is most certain there is none, never was, nor ever will be any such at all, besides the one Mediator betwixt God and man, the man Christ Jesus." And presently: [x] "If therefore these things be true that we have spoken so largely concerning infants, there neither is among the children of men, nor was, nor will be any without sin, except the one Mediator, in whom propitiation and justification is placed for us, whereby, the enmities of our sins being destroyed, we are reconciled to God." And to the same purpose doth the same Father begin his book of the Spirit and Letter, with which I shall end this article. [y] "Having read," saith he, "the works I sent lately to you, my dearest son Marcelline, concerning the baptism of infants, and the perfection of the righteousness of man, that none in this life ever did or ever will attain unto it, except the one Mediator who suffered human passions in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet without any sin at all." So clear and full is this with the rest of the Fathers, in determining what is here asserted, that *Christ was alone without sin.*

---

[u] Utrum qui omnino nunquam ullum peccatum habuerit, habiturusve sit, non solum quisquam natorum hominum sit, verum etiam potuerit aliquando esse vel possit? Hunc prorsus præter unum Mediatorem Dei et hominum, hominem Christum Jesum nullum esse, vel fuisse vel futurum esse certissimum est. Aug. de peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. 2. [34. Ibid.]

[x] Ideo si illa vera sunt quæ tam multa de parvulis diximus, nec est in filiis hominum quisquam, nec fuit, nec erit (sine peccato) excepto uno Mediatore, in quo nobis propitiatio et justificatio posita est, per quam, finitis inimicitiis peccatorum, reconciliamur Deo. Ibid.

[y] Lectis opusculis quæ ad te nuper elaboravi, fili charissime Marcelline, de baptismo parvulorum et de perfectione justitiæ hominis, quod eam nemo in hac vita vel assecutus, vel assecuturus videatur, excepto uno Mediatore, qui humana perpessus est in similitudine carnis peccati, sine ullo omnino peccato. Id. de spiritu et litera, ad Marcellinum, c. 1. [vol. X.]

ARTICLE XVI.

OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM.

Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and by the grace of God (we may) arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned that say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

THOUGH it is not so easily determined what the sin against the Holy Ghost is, yet it is easily determined what is not the sin against the Holy Ghost. Be sure every deadly sin, that is, every sin (for every sin is [a]deadly) willingly committed after baptism, is not the sin against the Holy Ghost. For, as St. Augustine[b] observes, Our Saviour, speaking of the sin against the Holy Ghost, doth not mention any particular time, but only saith in general, *He that speaketh against the Holy Ghost*, whether it be before or after baptism, that is not material. And they (the Pharisees) to whom these words were directed were not baptized, and yet our Saviour forewarns them to have a care of that sin: which shews that they, as well as such as are baptized, may fall into it. And it is observable also that at the same time our Saviour saith, *The sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven*, saith also, *All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men*, Matth. xii. 31. Not all manner of sin before or all manner of sin after baptism only, but all manner of sin whatsoever, (except this unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost,) shall be forgiven to such as truly repent of them, and believe in him that died for them; nay, all manner of sin against the Holy Ghost except this sin against the Holy Ghost, for certainly every sin against the Holy Ghost is not the sin against the Holy Ghost. The heathens [c] speak against the Holy Ghost, yet we do not say they are therefore incapable of pardon: nay, there is never a sin committed but is committed against the Holy Ghost as God; yet every sin is not unpardonable, and therefore not the sin against the Holy Ghost. *Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism.* Which is a clear inference from the premises. For if sins after baptism are capable of pardon from God, they cannot without sin be denied the grant of repentance from men. For *after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives.* A man that hath received strength to rise from sin to grace may fall from grace to sin, and yet may afterwards rise again from sin to grace, so as to repent of his former sins, and reform his future life. And if so, every sin of a regenerate man cannot be the sin against the Holy Ghost, for that shall never be pardoned: and it shall therefore only never be pardoned by God, because never repented of by us. For if it could be repented of by us, it could not but be pardoned by God, the promise of pardon to repentance running in general terms, that if a man do confess his sins to God, God will pardon his sins to him. And therefore, though a regenerate man may fall into sin, yet seeing he may also afterwards rise from it, and repent of it, it may also be pardoned to him; and therefore it is not the sin against the Holy Ghost. And therefore also are they *to be condemned that say they can no more sin as long as they are here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.* For if after baptism and regeneration we can sin no more, or if we do sin, it is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and so unpardonable; it must needs follow, that repentance is not to be granted to any that sin after baptism, for then it would be granted to the sin against the Holy Ghost, which God himself denies it to.

---

[a] *Πᾶσα δὲ ἁμαρτία καὶ ἡ τυχοῦσα θάνατον ἐπιφέρεται.* Theodor. Abucara de 5. inimicis. [init.] *Πᾶσα ἁμαρτία θάνατός ἐστι ψυχῆς.* Nazianz. Orat. funeb. in mortem patris. Omne peccatum pro quanto est offensa Dei et contra legem ejus æternam est de sua conditione et indignitate mortiferum secundum rigorem justitiæ, et a vita gloriæ separativum. Gers. de vita spirit. animæ. [p. 166. par. iii. vol. II.] *Εἰ δὲ τὸ κέντρον τοῦ θανάτου ἡ ἁμαρτία, οὐχ ἥδε ἢ ἥδε, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀδιορίστῳ, δηλονότι, πᾶσα ἁμαρτία, ἄσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ ἐφησυχάζων, οὐχ ὁ ἐλέγχων.* Basil. Reg. brevior. Reg. 4. [vol. II.]

[b] Si autem illud solum, quod adversus Spiritum S. dicitur, sine venia esse post acceptum baptismum putatur: primo Dominus cum inde loqueretur nullum tempus excepit, sed regulariter ait, *Qui dixerit verbum adversus Spiritum S. non remittetur ei.* Aug. Expos. epist. ad Rom. inchoat. [16. p. 935. par. ii. vol. III.]

---

[c] Nam et pagani qui appellantur, etiam nunc totam nostram religionem, quia jam ferro et cædibus prohibentur, maledictis contumeliisque insectantur; et quicquid de ipsa Trinitate dicimus, negando et blasphemando contemnunt. Non enim excipiunt sibi Spiritum Sanctum quem venerentur, ut in cætera sæviant; sed simul adversus omnia quæcunque sollicite de trina majestate loquimur, quanto possunt furore impietatis oblatrant, &c. Quos tamen quantum possumus adhortamur ad Christum cognoscendum, et per ipsum Patrem Deum, summoque et vero imperatori militandum esse suademus, eosque promissa impunitate præteritorum omnium peccatorum invitamus ad finem. Qua in re satis judicamus, etiamsi quid adversus Spiritum Sanctum in sua sacrilega superstitione dixerunt, cum Christiani facti fuerint sine ulla caligine dubitationis ignosci. Ibid. [15.]

The sum of all is this: Every sin willingly committed after baptism is not an unpardonable sin, but it may be repented of by us, and therefore pardoned by God.

And this is clear from the case of Simon Magus, who, as St. Augustine[d] observes, was baptized before he fell into that horrid sin which we from him call *simony;* and yet St. Peter admonished him, saying, *Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee,* Acts viii. 22. Which plainly shews, that though Simon did sin, yea, and against the Holy Ghost, yet Peter did not think he sinned the sin against the Holy Ghost, but that upon his prayer and repentance this his sin, his great sin, might be pardoned: [e]so that Peter did not deny the grant of repentance to him, but advised him to repent. Yea, and Peter himself after baptism denied his Master; but though he denied Christ, Christ did not deny the grant of repentance to him.

---

[d] Deinde Simon quem paulo ante commemoravi, jam baptismum acceperat, cum Spiritum Sanctum turpissimo mercatui subditum credidit; cui correpto a se Petrus tamen consilium pœnitendi dedit. Ib. [16.]

[e] Simonem quoque Magum arguens Petrus apostolus, quod tam male de Spiritu Sancto senserit, ut eum venalem putans pecunia sibi emendum proposcerit, non tamen ita de illo desperavit, ut veniæ locum nullum relinqueret; nam benigne etiam, ut eum pœniteret, admonuit. Ibid. [15.]

To which we might also add the many places of scripture where all are commanded to repent; but of what force would that command be, if we might repent and yet not be pardoned? [f] Certainly to exclude any penitents from pardon is to keep off all sinners from repentance: for it would be in vain to repent of their sins, if they might repent of them and yet not obtain a pardon for them. But what means that place also, *A just man falleth seven times, and riseth up again?* Prov. xxiv. 16. Doth it not intimate to us that a man may fall from grace given, and yet rise again? If he rise again, it must be by repentance: and therefore a just man may fall, a just man may sin, and yet he may afterwards repent, and if he repents and confesseth his sin, *God is just and righteous to forgive him his sin*, 1 John i. 9; and if God grants pardon, man cannot deny the grant of repentance to them that fall into sin and rise again.

But I need not insist any longer upon so plain a truth. For I have proved before, article IX. that there are remainders of sin in the best of saints, and in the article immediately before this, that the best of saints are guilty of sin; and therefore if after baptism and regeneration every sin were unpardonable, the saints themselves must all be damned, because guilty of sin after baptism and regeneration, and so none could be saved. The unregenerate could not be saved, because not regenerate; the regenerate could not be saved, because they sin after regeneration. Which to assert would inevitably lead us into atheism and blasphemy.

---

[f] Atque O frustrandæ fraternitatis irrisio! O miserorum lamentantium caduca deceptio! O hæreticæ institutionis inefficax et vana traditio! hortari ad satisfactionis pœnitentiam, et subtrahere de satisfactione medicinam! Dicere fratribus nostris, Plange et lachrymas funde, ac diebus et noctibus ingemisce, et pro abluendo et purgando delicto tuo largiter et frequenter operare; sed extra ecclesiam post omnia morieris! Quæcunque ad pacem pertinent facies, sed nullam pacem quam quæris accipies. Quis non statim pereat? Quis non ipsa desperatione deficiat? Quis non animum suum a proposito lamentationis avertat? Cyprian. Ep. ad Antonianum. [55. ad fin.] Præcludere est atque abscindere iter doloris ad pœnitendi viam, ut cum scripturis Dominus Deus revertentibus ad se et pœnitentibus blandiatur, nostra duritia et crudelitate, dum fructus pœnitentiæ intercipitur, pœnitentia ipsa tollatur. Ibid.

I shall not therefore speak any more to this article, but only to shew its agreement with the doctrine of the primitive church. Gregory Nyssen saith, [g] "In the choice of evils it is rather to be chosen, that a man having obtained baptism should be again in sin, than that he should end his life void of grace. For sin indeed may perhaps have pardon and mercy, whereof good people have great hope: but salvation is altogether forbidden to the other, by a certain and determinate sentence." And therefore every sin after baptism is not unpardonable. And Theodoret to the same purpose: [h] "But he that hath attained the gift of baptism calleth God Father, as one that is inserted into the order of the sons of grace. These therefore are commanded to say, *Forgive us our debts.* The wounds therefore that are made even after baptism are also curable."

Hence St. Cyprian, in whose days Novatianus, the grand oppugner of this plain truth, arose, saith, [i] "But I wonder that there are some so obstinate, as not to think repentance ought to be given to such as are fallen, or suppose that pardon should be denied to penitents, when it is written, *Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works.*" Apoc. ii. 5. And afterwards, [k] "Which reading to wit and holding, we think none ought to be driven away from the fruit of satisfaction and the hope of peace, when we know, according to the faith of the scriptures, God himself being the Author and Exhorter to it, sinners are compelled to act repentance, and pardon and indulgence is not denied to the penitents." And again : [l]"But seeing we find none ought to be prohibited from acting repentance, and that to such as deprecate and pray for the mercy of the Lord, according to that wherein he is merciful and holy, peace may be granted by his priests, the sighs of the sorrowful are to be admitted, and the fruit of repentance is not to be denied to such as grieve." So that after baptism such as do fall into sin are not therefore to be denied the grant of repentance. And this Father's testimony is to be of the greater value, because it was in his days this truth was first opposed, and so by him the first defended.

---

[g] In electione malorum magis est eligendum, ut salutare lavacrum assecutus, rursus sit in peccato, quam ut gratiæ expers vitam finiat. Nam peccatum quidem veniam fortasse consequetur, aut clementiam, cujus magna est spes apud bonos; alteri autem est omnino vetita salus ex certa et definita sententia. Nyssen. Orat. adversus eos qui differunt baptismum. [p. 219. vol. II.]

[h] Qui autem baptismatis donum est assecutus Patrem vocat Deum, ut qui in gratiæ filiorum ordinem sit allectus; ii ergo jussi sunt dicere, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra.* Sunt ergo medicabilia etiam quæ post baptismum fiunt vulnera. Theodoret. de divinis decretis, c. de pœnitentia, [28. lib. V. Hæret. fab. vol. IV.]

[i] Miror autem quosdam sic obstinatos esse ut dandam lapsis non putent pœnitentiam, aut pœnitentibus existiment veniam denegandam, cum scriptum sit, *Memento unde cecideris, et age pœnitentiam, et fac priora opera.* Cyprian. Epist. [55.] ad Antonianum.

[k] Quod legentes scilicet et tenentes neminem putamus a fructu satisfactionis et spe pacis arcendum, cum sciamus juxta scripturarum fidem, autore et hortatore ipso Deo, et ad agendam pœnitentiam peccatores redigi, et veniam atque indulgentiam pœnitentibus non denegari. Ibid. [ad calc.]

St. Augustine hath also many things to this purpose: [m]"But," saith he, "if any one think that then the word is spoken against the Holy Ghost when it is spoken by him to whom his sins are forgiven him by baptism, let them consider, that even from such, by the holiness of the church, the place of repentance is not taken away." And afterwards more sharply : [n]"For if ignorance only obtains pardon, and ignorance is not accepted but only before a man be baptized, not only if he speak a word against the Holy Ghost after baptism, but also if he speak against the Son of man, yea, and if he defile himself with fornication, homicide, or any other sin or fault after baptism, he cannot be cured by repentance. Which such as hold, they are excluded from the catholic communion, and it is judged that they cannot be partakers of God's mercy so long as they lie in that cruelty." I shall conclude these testimonies with that of the same Father: [o]"But the love of our neighbour, that is, the love of man, even unto the love of our enemy, the Lord himself commendeth to us; and we see how many that are baptized both acknowledge them to be true, and reverence them as the commands of God. But when they undergo the enmities of any one, they are so inflamed with the desire of revenge, that they burn with such flames of hatred, that they cannot be appeased though the Gospel itself be read and recited to them; and the churches are full of such men already baptized: which notwithstanding spiritual men do not cease in a brotherly way to admonish, and with the spirit of meekness they constantly instruct them, that they would be ready to meet and resist such temptations, and that they would love rather to reign in the peace of Christ, than to rejoice in the oppression of the enemy, which would be done in vain if there was no hope of pardon nor cure of repentance left for such sins or sinners."

---

[l] Quod si invenimus a pœnitentia agenda neminem debere prohiberi, et deprecantibus atque exorantibus Domini misericordiam, secundum quod ille misericors et pius est, per sacerdotes ejus pacem posse concedi, admittendus est plangentium gemitus, et pœnitentiæ fructus dolentibus non negandus. Ibid.

[m] Quod si quisquam tunc putat verbum dici adversus Spiritum Sanctum, cum ab eo dicitur cui jam per baptismum dimissa sunt peccata, attendant nec talibus per ecclesiæ sanctitatem auferri pœnitentiæ locum. Aug. Exposit. epist. ad Romanos inchoat. [16. part. ii. vol. III.]

[n] Si enim sola ignorantia veniam meretur, et ignorantia non accipitur nisi antequam quisquam fuerit baptizatus, non solum si adversus Spiritum Sanctum, sed etiam si adversus Filium hominis post baptismum dixerit verbum, et omnino si qua fornicatione, vel homicidio, vel ullo flagitio aut facinore post baptismum sese maculaverit, non potest pœnitendo curari. Quod qui senserunt, exclusi sunt a communione catholica, satisque judicatum est eos in illa crudelitate divinæ misericordiæ participes esse non posse. Ibid.

But notwithstanding this truth is so clear of itself, and hath had so many to stand up in the defence of it, yet hath it had its opposers too, especially in the primitive church. For Philastrius tells us, that [p]"in the persecution, because many believers fell, and were received again into repentance by the church, some being angry, or rather led with presumption and pride, endeavoured to sow a vain doctrine, separating themselves from the catholic church, and not agreeing with the goodness and mercy of Christ, and saying there is no place of repentance to be granted to a believer after baptism." By which words we may see that not only Philastrius himself calls this a vain doctrine, but that the whole church was against it, and that both in their judgment and practice, in that they granted repentance to such as had fallen after baptism. And that the primitive church was wholly against denying repentance to such as had fallen after baptism, appears also in that they so often condemned Novatianus for holding the contrary, as in two councils at Rome, and two at Carthage, and one in Italy, all about an. Dom. 254[q]; in which councils they also determined what is here asserted, that the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as sin after baptism.

---

[o] Dilectionem autem proximi, id est dilectionem hominis usque ad inimici dilectionem nobis Dominus ipse commendat; et videmus quam multi jam baptizati, et vera esse ista fateantur, et tanquam Domini præcepta venerentur. Cum autem perpessi fuerint alicujus inimicitias, ita rapiuntur animo ad ulciscendum, ut tantis inardescant facibus odiorum, ut nec prolato et recitato evangelio placari possint. Et talibus hominibus jam baptizatis ecclesiæ plenæ sunt, quos tamen spiritales viri fraterne admonere non cessant, et in spiritu lenitatis instanter instruunt, ut hujusmodi temptationibus occurrere atque resistere parati sint, et magis diligant in Christi pace regnare, quam de inimici oppressione lætari. Quod inaniter fieret si talium peccatorum nulla spes veniæ, nulla pœnitentiæ medicina remaneret. Ibid. [18.]

[p] In persecutione, quia lapsi sunt multi fideles, et in pœnitentiam suscepti sunt a catholica ecclesia, irati imo potius præsumptione ducti ac superbia, vanam doctrinam conati sunt seminare, separantes se ab ecclesia catholica, atque a Christi bonitate et misericordia dissonantes, et dicentes, non esse fideli post baptismum locum aliquem pœnitentiæ. Philastrius. [81.]

---

[q] This decree of the council at Rome, Eusebius recordeth in these words: Δόγμα παρίσταται τοῖς πᾶσι τὸν μὲν Νοουάτον ἅμα τοῖς αὐτῷ συνεπαρθεῖσι τούς τε συνευδοκεῖν τῇ μισαδέλφῳ καὶ ἀπανθρωποτάτῃ γνώμῃ τ' ἀνδρὸς προαιρουμένους ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡγεῖσθαι, τοὺς δὲ τῇ συμφορᾷ περιπεπτωκότας τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ἰᾶσθαι καὶ θεραπεύειν τοῖς τῆς μετανοίας φαρμάκοις. Euseb. hist. l. 6. c. [43.]

ARTICLE XVII.

OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour.

THOUGH in the other articles we may make use of reason as well as scripture and Fathers, yet in this we must make use of scripture and Fathers only, and not of reason[a]. For as the ordinary priests were not to enter into the holy of holies, so neither is carnal reason to venture upon this mystery of mysteries. For it concerns God's predestination, which must needs be infinitely above man's apprehension. So that a cockle-fish may as soon crowd the ocean into its narrow shell, as vain man ever comprehend the decrees of God. And hence it is that both in public and private I have still endeavoured to shun discourses of this nature: and now that I am unavoidably fallen upon it, I shall speak as little as possibly I can unto it, especially considering how many other truths are still behind to be insisted upon. And in that little that I shall speak, I shall labour to make use of as few of my own words as by any means I can, speaking nothing concerning this great mystery but what scripture and Fathers have expressly delivered unto me.

---

[a] Thus I find St. Augustine long ago entering upon his discourse De prædestinatione et gratia, premising this as a consideration to be attended through his whole discourse, even not to think that God's justice or wisdom can be measured with human reason. Sed quis ita desipiat, vel potius quis ita blasphemet, ut dicat de justitia Dei lege humanæ justitiæ disputandum? Quæ profecto si justitiæ Dei adversatur injusta est. Ab illo enim qui summe justus est, omne quod qualitercunque justum est, manare manifestum est. Quis ergo qui incommutabilem, manentem, et omnia quæ sunt condentem, regentem, atque servantem Dei sapientiam pendat humanæ sapientiæ arbitrio? De quo idem apostolus dicit, *quia sapientia carnis inimica est Deo.* Et alibi, *Sapientia hujus mundi stultitia est apud Deum.* Non est ergo de illa majestate divinæ sapientiæ humanæ vanitatis arbitrio disputandum. Aug. de prædestinatione et gratia, c. 2. [App. p. 51. vol. X.] And St. Chrysostome excellently, Οὐδὲν χεῖρον ἢ ὅταν τὶς ἀνθρωπίνοις λογισμοῖς τὰ θεῖα κρίνῃ καὶ μετρῇ πράγματα· οὕτω γὰρ ἀποπεσεῖται τῆς πέτρας ἐκείνης ἐκ πολλοῦ τοῦ μέτρου καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς ἀποστερηθήσεται· εἰ γὰρ ὁ τὰς τοῦ ἡλίου ἀκτῖνας ἀνθρωπίνοις θέλων καταλαβεῖν ὀφθαλμοῖς, οὐ μόνον οὐ καταλήψεται οὐδὲ ἀνθέξεται τοῦ προκειμένου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποπεσεῖται καὶ μυρίαν ὑποστήσεται βλάβην· πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὁ βουλόμενος πρὸς ἐκεῖνο τὸ φῶς ἀτενὲς ἰδεῖν διὰ τῶν οἰκείων λογισμῶν, πείσεται τοῦτο, καὶ ὑβρίζει εἰς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δωρεάν. Chrysost. in 2 Tim. hom. 2. init. [vol. IV.]

So much therefore of this article as I have transcribed contains an excellent description of election, or predestination to life, exactly consonant to the doctrine delivered by St. Paul to the Ephesians, in these words: *According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we may be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved.* Eph. i. 4, 5, 6. And to Timothy in these words: *Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling; not according to our works*[b], *but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Jesus Christ before the world began.* 2 Tim. i. 9.

And what the apostle did here deliver from God the primitive church learned and taught from him. St. Augustine expressly: [c]"Before he made us he foreknew us, and he chose us in his foreknowledge when he had not as yet made us. By whom could this be done but by him, who calls those things that are not as if they were? For the apostle saith, *Who chose us before the foundation of the world.* We are made within the world, but we were chosen before the world." And again: [d] "Out of those to whom the righteous severity had adjudged punishments, according to the inexpressible mercy of his hidden dispensation, he chose out vessels which he might fit for honour." And elsewhere: [e] "Firmly believe, and by no means doubt, that the Trinity, the unchangeable God, the certain foreknower of all things and works, both his own and men's, before all worlds did know to whom he would give grace by faith. Without which none from the beginning of the world to the end of it can be absolved from the guilt of his sin original and actual; for *these whom God foreknew, he did also predestinate to be conformable to the image of his Son.*"

---

[b] Οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν, φησὶν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν· τουτέστιν οὐδενὸς ἀναγκάζοντος, οὐδενὸς συμβουλεύοντος, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἰδίας προθέσεως· οἴκοθεν ἐκ τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ, ὁρμώμενος ἔσωσε, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ κατ' ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν. Ibid. [p. 335.]

[c] Antequam faceret nos præscivit nos, et in ipsa nos præscientia cum nondum fecisset elegit. Sed a quo hoc fieri potuit, nisi ab eo *qui vocat omnia quæ non sunt tanquam ea quæ sunt?* Apostolus enim dicit, *Qui elegit nos ante mundi constitutionem.* Intra mundum facti sumus, et ante mundum electi sumus. Aug. de prædestinatione et gratia, c. 5.

And thus Prosper also: [f] "The predestination of God no catholic person denieth, &c. But the faith of predestination is confirmed from the manifest authorities of the holy scriptures, to which it is not lawful by any means to ascribe those things that are wickedly done by men, who came into that proneness to fall, not from the creation of God, but from the sin or prevarication of the first parent: from the punishment whereof none is freed but by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, prepared and predestinated in the eternal council of God before the foundation of the world."

Fulgentius also hath delivered his opinion very clearly in this case: [g] "For God," saith he, "who made man, did himself prepare in his predestination, both the gift of illumination to believe, and the gift of perseverance to profit and persevere, and the gift of glorification to reign, for such to whom he pleased to give it: who also doth not any otherways perform in deed than was ordained by his unchangeable will. The truth of which predestination, whereby the apostle witnesseth we were predestinated in Christ before the foundation of the world, if any one refuse to receive with the belief of the heart, or to utter with the confession of the mouth, if, before the last day of this present life, he lay not aside the obstinacy of his impiety, whereby as a rebel he withstandeth the true and living God, it is manifest that he doth not belong to the number of those which God did before the foundation of the world freely choose in Christ, and predestinated unto the kingdom." And so I pass to what follows in the article.

---

[d] De his quibus pœnam severitas justa decreverat, secundum ineffabilem dispositionis occultæ misericordiam, elegit vasa quæ faceret in honorem. Ibid. c. 13.

[e] Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites, Trinitatem, Deum incommutabilem, rerum omnium atque operum tam suorum quam humanorum certissimum cognitorem, ante omnia sæcula scire, quibus esset per fidem gratiam largiturus: sine qua nemo potest ex initio mundi usque in finem a reatu peccati tam originalis quam actualis absolvi. *Quos enim Deus præscivit, et prædestinavit conformes fieri imaginis Filii sui.* Id. de fide ad Petrum diac. [77. App. vol. VI.]

[f] Prædestinationem Dei nullus catholicus negat, &c. Predestinationis autem fides multa sanctarum autoritate scripturarum munita est, cui nullo modo fas est ea quæ ab hominibus male aguntur ascribi: qui in proclivitatem cadendi, non ex conditione Dei, sed ex primi patris prævaricatione venerunt. De cujus pœna nemo liberatur, nisi per gratiam Domini nostri Jesu Christi præparatam, et prædestinatam in æterno consilio Dei ante constitutionem mundi. Prosper. ad capit. Gallor. c. 1. [p. 316.]

Wherefore, they who be endowed with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made the sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

After predestination itself described, here we have a description of such as are predestinated, leading them from grace to grace, and at length conducting them into glory. All which is virtually if not expressly contained in that excellent passage of the apostle to this purpose, from whence I suppose this part of the article was taken, where he saith, *For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.* Rom. viii. 29, 30. Which words St. Augustine having repeated, concludes: [h] "Of these who are predestinated none shall perish with the Devil, none of them shall remain under the power of the Devil unto death." And the same Father again, or, as others think, Fulgentius, to the same purpose: [i] "Firmly believe, and do not doubt, but that all that God of his bountiful goodness made vessels of mercy were predestinated of God before the foundation of the world unto the adoption of the children of God; and that neither any of them whom God predestinated to the kingdom of heaven can perish, nor any of those whom he did not predestinate unto life can be saved, for that predestination is the preparation of the free gift, whereby the apostle saith we are predestinated unto the adoption of the children of God by Jesus Christ to himself." And so doth Bradwarden the profound say: [k] "Predestination is the eternal preparation by the will of God, of final grace in the way, and eternal happiness in the country, for a reasonable creature." But to proceed:

---

[g] Deus enim qui hominem condidit, ipse prædestinatione sua et donum illuminationis ad credendum, et donum perseverantiæ ad proficiendum atque permanendum, et donum glorificationis ad regnandum, quibus dare voluit præparavit: quique non aliter perficit in opere, quam in sua sempiterna atque incommutabili habet voluntate dispositum. Cujus prædestinationis veritatem, qua nos ante mundi constitutionem prædestinatos in charitate testatur apostolus, si quis detrectet cordis credulitate recipere, vel oris confessione proferre, si, ante ultimum diem vitæ præsentis, impietatis suæ contumaciam, qua Deo vivo et vero rebellis obsistit, non abjecerit, manifestum est eum non pertinere ad eorum numerum, quos Deus in Christo ante mundi constitutionem gratis elegit, et prædestinavit ad regnum. Fulgent. de incarnatione et gratia Christi, [67.]

As the godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of

---

[h] Horum prædestinatorum nemo cum diabolo peribit, nemo usque ad mortem sub diaboli potestate remanebit. Aug. de Trinitate, l. 13. [20. vol. VIII.]

[i] Firmissime tene, et nullatenus dubites, omnes quos vasa misericordiæ gratuita bonitate Deus facit, ante constitutionem mundi in adoptionem filiorum Dei prædestinatos a Deo; neque perire posse aliquem eorum, quos Deus prædestinavit ad regnum cælorum, nec quemquam eorum quos non prædestinavit ad vitam ulla posse ratione salvari. Prædestinatio enim illa gratuitæ donationis est præparatio, qua nos apostolus ait prædestinatos in adoptionem filiorum Dei per Jesum Christum in ipsum. Id. de fide ad Petr. diac. [78. Ap. vol. VI.]

[k] Prædestinatio est æterna præparatio ex voluntate divina, gratiæ finalis in via, et beatitudinis sempiternæ in patria creaturæ rationali. Bradward. de caus. Dei, l. 1. c. 45.

the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchfulness of most unclean living, no less dangerous than desperation. Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy scripture: and, in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.

In which words there are several things briefly to be considered. First, that to holy and religious persons, the godly consideration of this doctrine of our election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort; which we see verified in the example of St. Paul, who, having considered the truth of this mystery, immediately triumphs with joy and comfort, crying out, *What shall we say then to these things? If God be with us, who can be against us? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.* Rom. viii. 31, 33. [1] Not, who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's people, or of God's servants, but *who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?* If God hath elected us, it is in vain for men or devils to accuse: if He be our friend, it is in vain for any one to be our foe.

But, secondly, though the godly consideration of this doctrine is the ground of great consolation to the godly, yet for curious and carnal persons to have it continually before their eyes is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either, first, into desperation; (and so indeed had St. Augustine no sooner explained and confirmed this great doctrine, but Hilarius Arelatensis sends him word, that some [m] were so moved with it, that they said, desperation was held forth to men by it;) or, secondly, into wretchfulness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation; a sad example of which St. Augustine relates: for, saith he, [n] "there was a certain man in our monastery, who being reproved by his brethren why he would do some things which he should not do, and not do some things which he should do, he answered, Whatsoever I am now, I shall be such a one as God foreknew I would be. Who truly (saith the Father) both said true, and yet this truth did not turn to good, but it so turned to evil, that leaving the society of the monastery he became a dog that returned to his vomit; and yet what he may be hereafter, it is uncertain."

---

[1] Καὶ οὐκ εἶπε τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ τῶν δούλων τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐδὲ κατὰ τῶν πιστῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἡ γὰρ ἐκλογὴ ἀρετῆς σημεῖόν ἐστιν. Chrysost. in Rom. hom. 15. [vol. III. p. 128. 39.]

And lastly, it is here very opportunely added, that we must receive God's promises as they be generally set forth in the holy scripture. Though they are but some that God hath elected, yet his promises are made to all: *Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest,* Matt. xi. 28: and, *Whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life,* John iii. 16. In the application of which and the like promises, we must not have respect to the eternity of God's purpose, but to the universality of his promise. His promises are made to all, and therefore are all bound to lay hold upon his promises: and as we are to receive his promises, so are we also to obey his precepts as made to all. So that in all our doings the will of God is to be followed as we have it expressly declared to us in his word:

---

[m] His verbis sanctitatis tuæ ita moventur, ut dicant quandam desperationem hominibus exhiberi. Hilar. Arel. Epist. ad August. [Aug. vol. II. ep. ccxxvi. 6.]

[n] Fuit quidam in nostro monasterio, qui corripientibus fratribus cur quædam non facienda faceret, et quædam facienda non faceret, respondebat, Qualiscunque nunc sum, talis ero qualem me Deus futurum esse præscivit. Qui profecto et verum dicebat; et hoc verum non proficiebat in bonum, sed usque adeo profecit in malum, ut deserta monasterii societate, fieret canis reversus ad suum vomitum, et tamen adhuc qualis sit futurus incertum est. Aug. de dono perseverantiæ. [38. vol. X.]

not considering whether God elected me from eternity, but whether I obey him in time; if I obey him in time, I may certainly conclude that he elected me from eternity. And thus do I find St. Augustine advising this doctrine to be so published, as that men may not thereby be brought off, but rather spurred on to obedience. [o] "It is of too much contention therefore," saith he, "either to deny predestination, or to doubt of predestination: which notwithstanding is not to be so preached to the people, that it may seem amongst the unskilful and dull-sighted multitude to be reprehended in its being preached. As the foreknowledge of God seems to be reprehended, which certainly they cannot deny, if it be said to men, whether you run or sleep, what he that cannot be deceived foreknew you would be, that you will be. But it is the part of a deceitful or unskilful physician to apply a profitable medicine so as that it either do no good, or else harm. But we must say, so run that ye may obtain, and in your very running you shall know that ye were so foreknown that ye would run lawfully; and so if there be any other way that the foreknowledge of God can be preached, whereby the idleness of man may be repelled." And in the next chapter, [p] "And that way which we told him that speaks to the people he ought to use in the preaching of predestination, I do not think it sufficient, unless he add this or something like to it, so as to say, You therefore ought to hope for this perseverance in obedience from the Father of lights, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, and desire it in your daily prayers: and in doing this, to trust that you are not strangers from the predestination of his people, because it is He that enabled you to do this. But be it far from you therefore to despair of yourselves, because you are commanded to put your trust in Him, and not in yourselves. For cursed be every man that putteth his trust in man; and it is good to trust in the Lord, rather than to trust in man; because, blessed are they that put their trust in him. And having this hope, do you serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling." And thus doth this reverend Father annex the same caution to this doctrine of predestination, that after him our reverend convocation did; even that, for all the truth of that doctrine, we are still to hope in God's promises and obey his precepts; or as it is here expressed, *We must receive God's promises as they be generally set forth in holy scripture: and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.*

---

[o] Nimiæ igitur contentionis est prædestinationi contradicere, vel de prædestinatione dubitare; quæ tamen non ita populis prædicanda est, ut apud imperitam vel tardioris intelligentiæ multitudinem redargui quodammodo ipsa sua prædicatione videatur. Sicut redargui videtur et præscientia Dei, quam certe negare non possunt, si dicatur hominibus, sive curratis sive dormiatis, quod vos præscivit, qui falli non potest, hoc eritis. Dolosi autem vel imperiti medici est utile medicamentum sic alligare, ut aut non prosit aut obsit. Sed dicendum est, Sic currite ut comprehendatis, atque in ipso cursu vestro ita vos esse præcognitos noveritis ut legitime curratis; et si quo alio modo Dei præscientia prædicari potest, ut hominis segnitia repellatur. Aug. de dono perseverantiæ, [56, 57. vol. X.]

[p] Illum etiam modum quo utendum esse in prædestinationis prædicatione nos diximus loquenti ad populum, non existimo debere sufficere, nisi hoc vel hujusmodi aliquid addat, ut dicat: vos itaque ipsam obediendi perseverantiam a patre luminum, a quo descendit omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum, sperare debetis, et quotidianis orationibus poscere; atque hoc faciendo confidere non vos esse a prædestinatione populi ejus alienos, quia etiam hoc, ut faciatis, ipse largitur. Absit autem a vobis ideo desperare de vobis, quoniam spem vestram in ipso habere jubemini, non in vobis: maledictus enim omnis homo, qui spem habet in homine; et bonum est confidere in Domino, quam confidere in homine, quia beati omnes qui confidunt in eum. Et hanc spem tenentes, servite Domino in timore, et exultate ei cum tremore. Ibid. [62.]

ARTICLE XVIII.

OF OBTAINING ETERNAL SALVATION ONLY BY THE NAME OF CHRIST.

They also are to be had accursed that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For the holy scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

AS there is no nation where there is not some religion or other professed in it, so neither is there any religion but what hath some professors or other that are serious in the profession of it. So that there may be some strict professors in the worst, as well as some loose professors in the best of all religions whatsoever. And though the loose professors of no religion can look for salvation by it, yet the strict professors of all religions expect happiness from that religion they do profess. The Indians hope to be saved as well as the Mahumetans; the Mahumetans hope to be saved as well as the Jews; and the Jews they hope to be saved as well as the Christians; and the Christians they hope to be saved as well as any of them. And yet all these religions being so contrary one to another, it is impossible they should all have happiness entailed upon them. And now the great question is, Which of all these religions a man had best pick out from amongst the rest, to settle himself upon, and to become a professor of; or which religion will be surest to bring salvation to us, if we be serious in our profession of it? Which question I have endeavoured elsewhere to determine; and here we have it decided by a whole council, even that it is the Christian religion that is not only the best, but the only way to true happiness and everlasting salvation; and that *they are to be accursed that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature.* So that let a man be never so strict a Jew, never so strict a Mahumetan, never so strict in any other religion whatsoever, unless he be a Christian he can never be saved. So that though many Christians may go to hell, yet none but Christians can ever go to heaven; many that profess Christ may not be saved, yet all that deny Christ are certain to be damned: for it is by Christ, and Christ only, that we can be saved.

And this appears very plainly from the word of God; for there doth Christ himself say, [a] *I am the way, the truth, and the life:* [b] *none cometh to the Father, but by me.* John xiv. 6. And if none can come to the Father but by Christ, it is by Christ only that we come to happiness: for it is he alone in whom we may be happy, without whom we cannot but be miserable. And as we cannot be happy unless we come to God, so neither can we come to God but only by faith in Christ. And therefore is it said, *He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already,* John iii. 18. [c] So that it is as certain that all that do not believe in him shall be condemned, as that all that do believe in him shall be pardoned: it is as certain we shall be damned without him, as it is certain we may be saved by him. And therefore also it is said expressly, *Neither is there salvation in*

---

[a] Ipsum audiamus, *Ego sum via et veritas et vita.* Si veritatem quæris viam tene, nam ipse est via quæ est veritas. Ipsa est quo is, ipsa est qua is. Non per aliud is ad illud, non per aliud venis ad Christum. Per Christum ad Christum venis. Quomodo per Christum ad Christum? Per Christum hominem ad Christum Deum. Aug. in Joh. tract. 13. [4. vol. III. par. ii.] Quid autem opus erat ut diceret, *Ego sum via, veritas et vita,* cum via cognita qua iret, restaret nosse quo iret, nisi quia ibat ad veritatem, ibat ad vitam? Ibat ergo per seipsum ad seipsum. Et nos quo imus nisi ad ipsum? Et qua imus nisi per ipsum? Ibid. tract. 69. [2.]

[b] *Ἀγαθὴ γὰρ ὄντως ὅδος ἀπαρεξόδευτος καὶ ἀπλανὴς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τὸν ὄντως ἀγαθὸν τὸν πατέρα φέρων· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔρχεται, φησὶ, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ δι᾽ ἐμοῦ· τοιαύτη μὲν οὖν ἡ ἡμετέρα πρὸς θεὸν ἄνοδος διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ.* Basil. de Spiritu S. c. 8. [vol. II.]

[c] *Εἰ τὸ πιστεύειν Χριστὸν υἱὸν εἶναι θεοῦ ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχει, τὸ ἀπιστεῖν ἐξ ἀνάγκης θάνατον.* Id. advers. Eunomium, l. 4. [vol. I.]

any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved, Acts iv. 12. That is, there is no other [d]thing in the whole world whereby our sins may be pardoned, our persons justified, and our souls saved, but only Jesus Christ the Son of God. It is only by him that we can be saved, as it was only for us that he was condemned: nay, he was therefore condemned only for us, that we might be saved only in him.

And to scripture we might add reason too, but that I have already demonstrated it from reason, not only elsewhere, but even in these Articles themselves, having before proved that all men were born in sin: art. IX. that all men have sin living in them; art. XV. that man cannot free himself from sin; art. X. nor deserve to be freed by any other; yea, and that it is by Christ only that he can be freed; art. XII. that it is Christ only, who by the value of his death can take away the guilt of those sins that lie upon him, and it is Christ only, who, by the virtue of his blood, can wash away the filth of those sins that reign over him; and if so, it must needs follow, that it is only by Christ that we can be saved. For if without him we be of what religion we will, we shall still lie in our sins: it is impossible that without him we should attain to happiness, for freedom from sin is the first step to happiness. So that as it is impossible hell should be heaven so long as God is not enjoyed there, so is it impossible a soul should be happy so long as sin reigns there. It is sin that made hell, and there is something of hell in every sin: and therefore, until sin be perfectly pardoned to us, we can never be perfectly free from misery; and until sin be subdued under us, we can never be perfectly brought to happiness. Now seeing it is only by Christ our transgressions can be pardoned, and only by Christ our corruptions can be conquered, it must needs be only by Christ our souls can be saved; and if it be only by Christ we can be saved, without him we cannot but be damned. And therefore, let a man be of what religion he please, and as strict in that religion as he can, unless Christ be his, and he be Christ's, his religion is in vain; he may be strict in his profession of it, but it will never bring any happiness to him. No, it is Christ, and Christ alone, we are to expect salvation from.

---

[d] And thus we find in scripture the name oft put for the thing itself, as *ἦν τε ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, ὡς ἕκατον εἴκοσιν, And the company of the names together were an hundred and twenty*, Acts i. 15. That is, as the Syriac renders it, ܐܝܬܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܡܢ ܟܢܫܐ ܕܐ̈ܢܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܐܐ ܘܥܣܪܝܢ, i. e. *But the company of men there were an hundred and twenty*. And so the vulgar Latin, *Erat autem turba hominum simul fere centum viginti*. And so is שם יהוה *The name of God* in scripture frequently put for God himself; as, שם אלהי יעקוב, *The name of the God of Jacob*, that is, *The God of Jacob defend thee*, Ps. xx. 2. Hence R. David upon that place, *And they shall know* כי שמי יהוה *that my name is Jehovah*, Jer. xvi. ult. saith, כמו כי אני יהוה כי הוא שמו ושמו הוא, i. e. As if he should have said, *that I am the Lord*, for that is his name, and his name is himself. And therefore is השם *The name* put sometime for God himself, as ויקב בן האשה הישראלית את השם *And the woman of the Israelitish son blasphemed the name*, that is, the Lord, or *the name of the Lord*, as our translation hath it, Lev. xxiv. 11. The reason of which denomination Elias saith is, לפי שאסור להזכיר אחד משמותיו לבטלה, that is, Because it is forbidden to remember any of his names in vain. Elias in Thisb. [p. 247.] Where he saith also, it is never used for God but with הא הידיעה an emphatical *He* before it, viz. השם. But we may see the contrary in the same chapter with that before quoted, viz. Lev. xxiv. 16, where it is said, בנקבו שם, i. e. *when he blasphemeth the name*, that is, *the Lord*, or *the name of the Lord*, as we render it; and so the LXX, *τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου*. Syr. ܫܡܝ *my name;* Jonath. שמא דמייחד the proper name, viz. of God, which is *Jehovah*.

The Fathers are also very express in this particular. Ignatius plainly: [e] "Let no man be deceived; unless he believe that Jesus Christ was conversant in the flesh, and acknowledge his cross and passion, and blood which he shed for the salvation of the world, he cannot attain to everlasting life, whether he be a king or a priest or a prince; whether he be a private man, or a lord or a servant, or a man or a woman." None saved without Christ. For as Justin Martyr saith, [f] "In whom is it possible for us sinful and ungodly persons to be justified but only in the Son of God? Oh sweet change! Oh unsearchable contrivance! Oh unexpected benefits! That the sin of many should be hid in one just Person, and the righteousness of one should justify many sinners!"

And hence it is that the Fathers are so peremptory in avouching, that there is no salvation to be had, but only within the pale of the church. [g]"Let no man therefore," saith Origen, "persuade himself, let no man deceive himself; without this house, that is, without the church, there is none saved." And St. Cyprian, [h]"Neither can they live without, seeing the house of God is but one, and none can have salvation but only in the church." And so Gaudentius: [i]"But it is manifest that all the men of that time perished in the flood, but only such as obtained to be found within the ark, which bore the type of the church. For in like manner now they can by no means be saved that are strangers to the apostolic faith and catholic church."

---

[e] Μηδεὶς πλανάσθω· ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσῃ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐν σαρκὶ πεπολιτεῦσθαι, καὶ ὁμολογήσῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τὸ αἷμα ὃ ἐξέχεεν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου σωτηρίας, οὐ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τεύξεται, κᾆν βασιλεὺς ᾖ, κᾆν ἱερεὺς, κᾆν ἄρχων, κᾆν ἰδιώτης, κᾆν δεσπότης, κᾆν δοῦλος, κᾆν ἀνὴρ, ἦ γυνή. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrnenses, [p. 115.]

[f] Ἐν τίνι δικαιωθῆναι δυνατὸν τοὺς ἀνόμους ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀσεβεῖς, ἦ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ; ὦ τῆς γλυκείας ἀνταλλαγῆς, ὦ τῆς ἀνεξιχνιάστου δημιουργίας, ὦ τῶν ἀπροσδοκήτων εὐεργεσιῶν, ἵνα ἀνομία μὲν πολλῶν ἐν δικαίῳ ἑνὶ κρυβῇ, δικαιοσύνη δὲ ἑνὸς πολλοὺς ἀνόμους δικαιώσῃ. Just. Epist. ad Diognet. [9.]

And St. Augustine or Fulgentius to the same purpose: [k]"Firmly believe, and doubt not at all, but that not only all pagans, but also all Jews, heretics, and schismatics, that end this present life without the catholic church, shall go into eternal fire, which is prepared for the Devil and his angels." For as the same Father, St. Augustine, elsewhere saith, [l]"Do not believe you can be saved by any other art than by the invocation and cross of Christ." And to name no more, the fourth council at Lateran also expressly saith, [m]"But there is one universal church of the faithful, out of which there is none at all saved." And therefore we may well conclude, it is only by the name of Christ that eternal salvation can be obtained.

---

[g] Nemo ergo sibi persuadeat, nemo seipsum decipiat; extra hanc domum, id est extra ecclesiam, nemo salvatur. Origen. super Jesum Nave, hom. 3. [5. vol. I.]

[h] Neque enim vivere foris possunt, cum domus Dei una sit, et nemini salus esse nisi in ecclesia possit. Cyprian. Epist. ad Pomponium, [iv.]

[i] Periisse autem constat in illo diluvio omnes ipsius temporis homines, præter eos qui intra arcam, quæ typum gerebat ecclesiæ, reperiri meruerint. Nam similiter etiam nunc omnino salvi esse non poterunt, qui ab apostolica fide et ab ecclesia catholica fuerint alieni. Gaudent. episc. Brix. de lect. evang. tract. [8. vol. V. p. 955. Bibl. Max. Patr.]

[k] Firmissime tene, et nullatenus dubites non solum omnes paganos, sed etiam omnes Judæos, hæreticos atque schismaticos, qui extra ecclesiam catholicam præsentem finiunt vitam, in ignem æternum ituros, qui præparatus est diabolo et angelis ejus. De fide ad Petrum diaconum, [81. Aug. vol. VI. App.]

[l] Per nullam aliam artem salvari vos credatis, nisi per invocationem et crucem Christi. Aug. de rectitudine catholicæ conversationis, [5. Ibid.]

[m] Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. Concil. Lateran. 4. de fide catholica, [Conc. vol. VII. p. 15.]

ARTICLE XIX.

OF THE CHURCH.

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered, according to God's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

THOUGH the church of Christ be one and the same church both in heaven and in earth, yet it there differs much from itself as here. There it is triumphant, not militant; here it is militant, not triumphant: there it consisteth of good only, and not of bad; here of bad also as well as good. And to name no more, there it is invisible as to us; here it is visible unto all. We cannot see the church as crowned with glory in heaven; but any one may see it as established by grace on earth. And the church as thus visible is the subject of this article; so much of it as I have transcribed containing nothing but a full and excellent description of this visible church; which I the unworthiest of its members, by the assistance of Him who is the Head, shall endeavour to illustrate and confirm, speaking to every particular notion in it as it stands in order.

First therefore, the visible church is here said to be a congregation. And indeed though[a] our word church doth not imply so much, yet the Greek word used by the apostles, which we commonly translate church, doth, [b] not as to the etymology and notation, but howsoever as to the common use and acceptation of it; it being sometimes used to signify an [c] assembly or congregation in general, and sometimes for such a congregation as profess faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore used also, though perhaps not in scripture, yet in other writings, to denote [d] the place where such congregations or gatherings together of people were made. And that the Greek word which we translate church doth in its most proper sense signify a congregation, and by consequence that the church may well be called a congregation is plain also from the [e] most ancient, I mean, the oriental translations, that

---

[a] That the word *church* doth not imply a congregation is plain from the Greek word it is derived from, viz. κυριακὴ, the Lord's house, from whence the Scots call it kyrke, and we church. Neither is this any new found word to express the Greek ἐκκλησία by. For Eusebius saith, that even in his time the places consecrated to the worship of God were called κυριακαί: his words be these: Ἔνθε δὲ καὶ τοῦ δεσπότου κατηγορίας ἠξίωται τὰ καθιερωμένα οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τυχόντα τῆς ἐπικλήσεως· ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ τῶν ὅλων κυρίου· παρὸ καὶ κυριακῶν ἠξίωνται τῶν ἐπωνυμιῶν. Eu-

---

seb. Orat. de laudibus Constantini. [vol. I. p. 770.] And hence it is that we to this day call it the church. But there seems to be this difference betwixt *ἐκκλησία* and *κυριακὴ*, viz. *οἰκία*, that *ἐκκλησία* in the first place signifies the congregation met together in a place, and then the place where they meet; but *κυριακὴ*, the kyrke or church, doth in the first place signify the place where the congregation meets, and then the congregation that meets in that place.

[b] The Greek word is *ἐκκλησία*, from *ἐκκαλεῖν*, which signifies properly *evocare*, not *convocare*. So Methodius, *ὅτι ἐκκλησίαν παρὰ τὸ ἐκκεκληκέναι τὰς ἡδονὰς λέγεσθαί φησιν*, Phot. Biblioth. [p. 938.] Whence Cyril of Hierusalem also saith, *Ἐκκλησία δὲ καλεῖται φερωνύμως διὰ τὸ πάντας ἐκκαλεῖσθαι καὶ ὁμοῦ συνάγειν*. Cyril. Catech. 18. [11.] Though St. Augustin makes *ecclesia* to be the same with *convocatio*, Quamvis enim propriæ dicatur synagoga Judæorum, ecclesia vero Christianorum, quia congregatio magis pecorum, convocatio vero magis hominum intelligi solet. Aug. in Psal. 77. [3. vol. IV.] Sive quod inter congregationem unde synagoga, et convocationem unde ecclesia nomen accepit, aliquid distet. Id. in Psal. 81. [1. Ibid.]

[c] For an assembly or convocation in general, we find it used Acts xix. 32, where it is said, *ἦν γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία συγκεχυμένη, for the assembly was confused;* and so Thucydides, *καταστάσης δὲ ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἀντιλογίαν ἦλθον.* Hist. L. 1. [31], and Ammonius, *Ἐκκλησίαν ἔλεγον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν σύνοδον τῶν κατὰ πόλιν.* Ammon.

[d] As in St. Chrysostom, *Εἰ γὰρ ἐκκλησίαν κατασκάψαι χαλεπὸν καὶ ἀνόσιον, πολλῷ μαλλὸν ναὸν πνευματικὸν, καὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἐκκλησίας σεμνότερον.* Chrysost. in Rom. Hom. 26. [vol. III. p. 210, 9.] And St. Augustine, Sicut ergo appellamus ecclesiam Basilicam qua continetur populus, qui vere appellatur ecclesia, ut nomine ecclesiæ, id est, populi qui continetur, significemus locum qui continet. Aug. Epist. ad Optatum, [190, 19. vol. II.]

[e] The Syriac always renders it by ܥܕܬܐ, as *καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας ἐφ᾽ ὅλην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, Syriac, ܘܗܘܬ ܕܚܠܬܐ ܪܒܬܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܥܕܬܐ, *and there was great fear in all the church*, Acts v. 11, and so elsewhere. Now ܥܕܬܐ plainly signifies a company, a congregation, an assembly, from the Hebrew עֵדָה. But it is observable, that though the word do signify in general a congregation, it is seldom or never used to signify any other congregation but that of the faithful, viz. the church: nay

always render it by words signifying a congregation. And therefore also in our old English translations it was mostly if not always rendered congregation, instead of which we now read church.

That therefore the church is a congregation we need not insist any longer in the proving of. But howsoever, before we pass from it, we must consider how it is here said to be a congregation in the singular, not congregations in the plural number. Whence we must observe, that though the visible church may consist of many congregations, yet it so consisteth of many, as still to be but one congregation; those many congregations being [f] all built upon one foundation and stone, and [g] all members of one and the same Head, and [h] all agreeing in one and the same faith. And therefore, as the body that consisteth of many members is still but one body, so the church that consisteth of many congregations is still but one church. So that though every one of these congregations be

---

though there be *ἐκκλησία* in the original, unless it denotes the church, it is not rendered by ܥܕܬܐ, ut ܟܢܫܐ or ܟܢܘܫܬܐ, or the like, as we may see Acts xix. 32. 40. The Arabic sometimes renders it by جماعة, as in the place before quoted, Acts v. 11. Sometimes it renders it by كنيسة, as Acts ii. 47, both signifying *congregatio, agmen, turba,* &c. The Ethiopic usually renders it by ቤተ፡ ክርስትያናት፡ *the Christian houses,* Acts v. 11, and in the singular number, ቤተ፡ ክርስቲያን፡ *the Christian house,* or *the house of Christ,* Matt. xviii. 17.

[f] This is that which St. Cyprian calls *unitas originis;* as, Ecclesia una est quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fœcunditatis extenditur: quomodo solis multi radii, sed unum lumen; et rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum; et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copiæ largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine, &c. Cyprian. [p. 108.] de simplicitate prælatorum.

[g] Ecclesia dicitur una, quia unum habet caput quod est Christus. Aug. in quæst. vet. et novi testam. q. 47. [vol. III. App.]

[h] Quia ecclesia ex pluribus personis congregatur, et tamen una dicitur propter unitatem fidei. Hieron. in Psal. xxiii. [vol. VII. App. p. 59.] For as Irenæus saith, Τοῦτο *τὸ κήρυγμα παρειληφυῖα, καὶ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν, ὡς προέφαμεν, ἡ ἐκκλησία καίπερ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη ἐπιμελῶς φυλάσσει, ὡς ἕνα οἶκον οἰκοῦσα· καὶ ὁμοίως πιστεύει τούτοις, ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα καρδίαν, καὶ συμφώνως ταῦτα κηρύσσει, καὶ διδάσκει, καὶ παραδίδωσιν ὡς ἓν στόμα κεκτημένη· καὶ γὰρ αἱ κατὰ τὸν κόσμον διάλεκτοι ἀνόμοιαι, ἀλλ' ἡ δύναμις τῆς παραδόσεως μία καὶ ἡ αὐτή.* Iren. Adv. Hæres. l. 1. c. [x. 2.] *Καθὼς λέγουσιν οὗτοι οἱ ἀληθῶς ἔρημοι θείας συνέσεως διδάσκαλοι τῆς οὔσης ἐκκλησίας πάσης, μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πίστιν ἐχούσης εἰς πάντα τὸν κόσμον, καθὼς προέφαμεν,* ibid. [3.]

itself a particular church, (whence we read of the church of Corinth, 1 Cor. i. 2, the church of Thyatira, the church of Pergamus, the church of Philadelphia, the church of Ephesus, and so also sometimes in the plural number the churches of Asia, the churches of Galatia, &c., I say, though every one of these be a particular church,) and all of them particular churches, yet in reference to the one Head they are governed by, and the one faith they agree in, they are all but one [i] catholic or universal church; they are all but the one visible church spoken of in this article. And therefore, as the visible church is a congregation, so is it but one congregation.

---

[i] I say catholic or universal, because I look upon that as the right and proper notion of the word catholic, as Theophilus Antiochenus useth it in those words, ὅτι δυνατός ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς ποιῆσαι τὴν καθολικὴν ἀνάστασιν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων. Theoph. adv. Autol. l. 1. [18.] And in this sense it is that Isidorus Hispalensis saith the church is called catholic. Sancta ecclesia ideo dicitur catholica pro eo quod universaliter per omnem mundum sit diffusa. Isidor. de summo bono, l. 1. c. [16.] And so others too; as, Inde dicta est catholica quia sit rationalis et ubique diffusa. Optat. l. 2. Καθολικὴ μὲν καλεῖται διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης εἶναι τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπὸ περάτων γῆς ἕως περάτων. Cyril. Catech. 18. [11.] Though the Fathers do often use the word catholic also for what we call orthodox, viz. in opposition to heretics. Dissensio quippe vos et divisio facit hæreticos, pax vero et unitas facit catholicos. Aug. contra liter. Petil. l. 2. [219. vol. IX.]; where we see *catholicus* and *hæreticus* opposed to one another. And hence it is that I have one Greek copy of Athanasius's Creed that begins, Εἰ τὶς θέλει σωθῆναι, πρὸ πάντων χρὴ αὐτῷ τὴν καθολικὴν κρατῆσαι πίστιν, but another, Εἰ τὶς βούλοιτο σωθῆναι, πρὸ πάντων αὐτῷ χρεία κρατῆσαι τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν, so that καθολικὴ and ὀρθόδοξος both signify the same thing. [vol. II. pp. 728, 731.] And in this sense I suppose it is, that particular churches are also sometimes called catholic, as when it is said, Ὁ ἐκδικητὴς οὖν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐκ ἠπίστατο ἕνα ἐπίσκοπον δεῖν εἶναι ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐν ᾗ οὐκ ἠγνόει, πῶς γάρ; πρεσβυτέρους εἶναι τεσσαράκοντα ἕξ. Euseb. Hist. l. 6. [43. p. 272. vol. II.] And in the letter of the church of Smyrna concerning the martyrdom of their bishop Polycarp, it is said of Polycarp, that he was διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς, καὶ προφητικὸς, γενόμενος, ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. ibid. l. 4. c. 15. [p. 355. vol. I.] And so it is said also of Callinicus: Καλλίνικον δὲ ὡς ἐπίσκοπον ὄντα ἐν Πηλουσίῳ τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας. Sozom. Hist. l. 2. c. [25.] And Constantine the emperor, writing an epistle to the church of Alexandria, begins it thus, Κωνσταντῖνος σεβαστὸς τῇ καθολικῇ Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίᾳ. Socrat. Hist. l. 1. c. [9.] And thus doth Gregory Nazianzen [App. vol. I.] also in his last will style himself Γρηγόριος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντίνου πόλει, and the witnessses being bishops too, they subscribed themselves bishops of catholic churches too, as, Ἀμφιλόχιος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἰκονίῳ. Ὀπτίμος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, &c. Yea καθολικὴ it seems was so usually ascribed to particular churches, that Constantine in another epistle to the church of Alexandria calls that church by no other name than καθολικὴ, beginning his said epistle Κωνσταντῖνος

But though the visible church be a congregation, yet every congregation is not the visible church. To distinguish therefore this from all other congregations, it is here said, in the second place, *The visible church is a congregation of faithful men;* it is a congregation of such men as profess faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, so that all that profess true faith in Christ are of the visible church, and there are none of the visible church but only such as do profess faith in Christ. And therefore in the Creed is the church called *the holy catholic church*, not as if every person in it was really holy, really saints, real believers in Christ: for we know that the visible church here on earth is like to a floor in which is both wheat and chaff, Matt. iii. 12; it is like a field in which there is both tares and wheat, Matt. xiii. 24; it is like a net that gathereth of every kind, fishes good and bad, ver. 47; it is like Noah's ark, wherein were all sorts of beasts, both clean and unclean. In the church indeed triumphant in heaven, there are saints only, and no sinners; but in the church militant upon earth there are sinners also as well as saints, as the [k] Fathers long ago taught. But when it is said in the

---

Καῖσαρ τῷ λαῷ τῆς καθολικῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων. Socrat. Hist. l. 2. c. [3. ed. *Colon.* 1612.] And when the word is thus applied to particular churches, it seems plainly to imply no more than orthodox, holding the same faith that the whole catholic church doth. But why the church in general should be called the catholic church, Isidorus Hispalensis gives us several reasons besides the above-mentioned; Catholica autem ideo dicitur (ecclesia) quia per universum mundum est instituta; vel catholica quia universalis in ea doctrina est, ad institutionem hominum de visibilibus rebus cælestium atque terrestrium; vel propterea quod hominum omne genus trahit ad se ad pietatis subjectionem tam principum quam etiam principatui subjectorum, oratorum et idiotarum; vel propterea quod generaliter curat hominum peccata, quæ per corpus et animam perficiuntur. Isidor. Hisp. de off. eccles. l. 1. c. 1.

[k] Si enim propterea retibus bonos et malos congregantibus ecclesiam comparavit, quia malos in ecclesia non manifestos sed latentes intelligi voluit, quos ita nesciunt sacerdotes, quemadmodum sub fluctibus quid acceperint retia, nesciunt piscatores; propterea ergo et areæ comparata est, ut etiam manifesti mali cum bonis in ea prænunciarentur futuri. Aug. contra Donatist. post Collat. [13. vol. IX. p. 588.] Victi evidentia veritatis, malos in ecclesia usque in finem seculi permixtos esse confessi sunt. ibid. [11.] Ecce manifestum est quod dicebatur a nobis distinguenda esse tempora ecclesiæ, non eam nunc esse talem, qualis post resurrectionem futura est; nunc malos habere permixtos, tunc omnino non habituram; ad illam ejus puritatem non ad hujus temporis permixtionem illa divina testimonia pertinere, quibus eam Dominus prædixit ab omni malorum permixtione penitus alienam. ibid. [12.] Arca

Creed to be a holy and catholic church, and here the church is called a congregation of faithful men, it is so to be understood, as that there are none of the visible church, but only such as profess holiness and faith, though they be not really faithful and holy. For it is this outward profession of faith in Christ that entitles us to church-membership here on earth, though it is only the inward possession of Christ by faith that entitles us to communion with the invisible church in heaven. But that the church is a congregation of faithful men, even of such as profess faith in Christ, is plain from the constant practice of the church in all ages, never to admit any into communion with it but such as have either by themselves or sureties made such a profession. And therefore we read also, how *they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added to the church about three thousand souls*, Acts ii. 41. So that they first received his word before they were baptized, and none were baptized and so brought into the church but such as had first received his word, viz. what he had taught concerning the Lord Jesus Christ. And therefore the church must needs be a congregation of faithful men, for until they be faithful men they cannot be of the church. And as unless they be faithful men they cannot come into the church, so as long as they continue in the church they must needs be faithful men: for their continuing in the church of Christ argues their faith in him in whose church they thus continue. Did they not believe in his death, they would not remain in his church. And therefore we cannot but conclude, that the church is a congregation of faithful men.

But though the church be always a congregation of faithful men, yet every congregation of faithful men is not a church. Therefore in the last place it is here said, *The visible church is a congregation of faithful men, wherein the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to God's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite*

Noæ ecclesiæ typus est: ut in illa omnium animalium genera, ita et in hac universarum et gentium et morum homines sunt; ut ibi pardus et hœdi, lupus et agni; ita et hic justi et peccatores, id est vasa aurea et argentea cum ligneis et fictilibus commorantur. Hieron. advers. Lucifer. [22. vol. II.]

to the same. So that though there be a congregation of faithful men met together, unless the word of God be truly preached, and the sacraments of Christ duly administered in it, that congregation of faithful men is not a church. Where what we are to understand by being duly administered, the article itself expounds to us, even that the sacraments be administered according to God's ordinance in all things that are of necessity requisite to the same; as, that baptism be administered *in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost*, Matt. xxviii. 19; that the Lord's supper be administered according to Christ's institution, left on record for our imitation, Matt. xxvi. 26, 27. 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24, 25. And that the church is such a congregation wherein the word is so preached, and the sacraments so administered, is plain, in that the word hath been so preached, and the sacraments so administered ever since it was a church. As we may see in the Acts of the Apostles, where we can scarce meet with the church, but we shall find it either preaching the word, chap. ii. iii. vii. viii. xiii., or administering the sacrament of baptism, ii. 41. viii. 38, or breaking of bread, ii. 46, &c.

And hence it is that the Fathers still asserted that the church cannot subsist without church-officers, such whose duty it is thus to preach the word and administer the sacraments. [l]"Do you," saith Ignatius, "reverence them as Christ Jesus, whose vicegerents they are, as the bishop is also the type of the Father of all things, and the presbyters also are the assembly of God, and as the company of the apostles of Christ joined together. Without these there is no church chosen, no assembly holy, no congregation of saints." And so St. Hierome, [m]"For it is no church that hath not priests." And what is the reason that there can be no church without priests, but because the word cannot be rightly preached nor the sacraments rightly administered without them? And seeing these things cannot be done without them, there can be no church without them. With this description of the church agrees that of Lactantius: [n] "But," saith he, "because every company of heretics think themselves principally to be Christians, and that theirs is the catholic church, we must know that that is the true church wherein there is confession and repentance, which doth wholesomely cure the sins and wounds which the frailty of the flesh is subject to." And therefore the church must needs be a congregation of faithful men, if confession, viz. of Christ crucified and repentance, must needs be in the true church; for these are the principal things wherein that faithfulness consisteth. And again, saith he, [o] "For when they are called Phrygians, or Novatians, or Valentinians, or Marcionites, or Anthropians, or the like, they cease to be Christians, who, leaving the name of Christ, take up human and external words. That is therefore the only catholic church which retains true worship." Now it is impossible any church should retain true worship without the word and sacraments, these being the principal parts of true worship; and therefore it is necessary that we should confess, that *the visible church is a congregation of faithful men, wherein the word is truly preached, and the sacraments be duly administered.*

---

[l] Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐντρέπεσθε αὐτοὺς ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν οὗ φύλακές εἰσιν τοῦ τόπου, ὡς καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων τύπος ὑπάρχει· οἱ δὲ πρεσβύτεροι ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ, καὶ σύνδεσμος ἀποστόλων Χριστοῦ· χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία ἐκλεκτὴ οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐ συνάθροισμα ἁγίων, οὐ συναγωγὴ ὁσίων. Ignat. Epist. ad Trall. [p. 66.]

[m] Ecclesia non enim quæ non habet sacerdotes. Hieron. adv. Lucifer. [21. vol. II.]

As the church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also hath the church of Rome erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

After the catholic or universal church described, here we have a particular church to be considered. Indeed, here are several particular churches contained under the forenamed catholic church, mentioned, viz. the church of Jerusalem, the church of Alexandria, the church of Antioch, and the church of Rome: but it is the church of Rome which seems to be principally aimed at in this place; that being the chief if not the only particular church that ever pretended to infallibility. That the catholic or universal church is infallible, so as constantly and firmly to maintain and hold every particular necessary truth delivered in the gospel in one place or other, cannot be denied; but that any particular church, or the church of Rome in particular, is infallible, we have it expressly denied and opposed in this article, it being here expressly asserted, that *the church of Rome hath erred, and that not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but even in matters of faith.*

---

[n] Sed tamen quia singuli quique cœtus hæreticorum se potissimum Christianos, et suam esse catholicam ecclesiam putant, sciendum est illam esse veram, in qua est confessio et pœnitentia, quæ peccata et vulnera, quibus subjecta est imbecillitas carnis, salubriter curat. Lactant. de vera sap. [lib. IV.] fin.

[o] Cum enim Phryges, aut Novatiani, aut Valentiniani, aut Marcionitæ, aut Anthropiani, seu quilibet alii nominantur, Christiani esse desierunt, qui Christi nomine amisso, humana et externa vocabula induerunt. Sola igitur catholica ecclesia est, quæ verum cultum retinet. Ibid.

Now to prove that the church of Rome hath erred, even in matters of faith, I think the best way is to compare the doctrine maintained by them with the doctrine delivered in these Articles. For whatsoever is contained in these Articles, we have, or shall by the assistance of God prove to be consonant to scripture, reason, and Fathers; and by consequence to be a real truth. And therefore whatsoever is any way contrary to what is here delivered must needs be an error. And so that besides other errors which the church of Rome holds, be sure, whereinsoever it differs from the doctrine of the church of England, therein it errs. Now to prove that the church of Rome doth hold such doctrines as are contrary to the doctrine of the church of England, I shall not insist upon any particular though never so eminent persons amongst them, that have delivered many doctrines contrary to ours: for I know, as it is amongst ourselves, that is not an error of our church that is the error of some one or many particular persons in it; so also among them, every thing that Bellarmine, Johannes de Turrecremata, Gregorius de Valentia, Alphonsus de Castro, or any of the grandees of their church saith, cannot be accounted as an error of their church, if it be false, nor if it be true, as the truth of the whole church. A church may be catholic though it hath many heretics in it; and a church may be heretical though it hath many catholics in it. And therefore, I say, to prove the doctrine of their church to be erroneous, I shall not take any notice of the errors of particular persons, but of the errors deliberately and unanimously concluded upon, and subscribed to, and published as the doctrine of that church by the whole church itself met together in council: for the doctrine delivered by a council cannot be denied to be the doctrine of the whole church there represented. As the doctrine delivered in these Articles, because it was concluded upon in a council of English divines, is accounted the doctrine of the church of England; and so the doctrine concluded upon in a council of Romish divines cannot be denied to be the doctrine of the church of Rome. And of all the councils they have held, that which I shall pitch upon in this case is the council of Trent, both because it was the most general council they ever held, and also because it was held about the same time at Trent that our convocation that composed these Articles was held at London. For it was in the year of our Lord 1562 that our convocation that concluded upon these Articles was held at London; and though the council of Trent was begun in the year of our Lord 1545, yet it was not concluded and confirmed till the fifth year of pope Pius the Fourth, ann. Dom. [1564,] as appears [q] from the said pope Pius's bull for the confirmation of it. So that our convocation was held within the same time that that council was. And so our church concluded upon truths here, whilst theirs agreed upon errors there. Neither need we go any further to prove that they agreed upon errors, than by shewing that many things that they did then subscribe to were contrary to what our church about the same time concluded upon.

For all our Articles are, as we may see, agreeable to scripture, reason, and Fathers: and they delivering many things quite contrary to the said Articles, so many of them must needs be contrary both to scripture, reason, and Fathers too, and therefore cannot but be errors. And so in shewing that the doctrine of the church of Rome is in many things contrary to the church of England, I shall prove from scripture, reason, and Fathers the truth of this proposition, that the church of Rome hath erred even in matters of faith.

---

[q] For this bull ends thus; Datum Romæ apud sanctum Petrum, anno incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo quingentesimo sexagesimo [quarto], septimo kalend. Februarii, pontificatus nostri anno quinto. Bull. sup. confirmat. concil. Trident. [Conc. vol. X. p. 197.]

Now, though there be many things wherein the church of Rome did at that, and so still doth at this time, disagree with ours, yet I shall pick out but some of those propositions that do in plain terms contradict these Articles.

As first, we say, art. VI, scripture is sufficient, &c. and the other books, (viz. commonly called the Apocrypha,) the church doth not apply them to establish any doctrine. But the church of Rome thrusts them into the body of canonical scriptures, and accounts them as canonical as any of the rest; saying, [r] "But this synod thought good to write down to this decree an index to the holy books, lest any one should doubt which they are that are received by this council. But they are the underwritten. Of the Old Testament, the five books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four books of the Kings, two of the Chronicles, Esdras I. and II., which is called Nehemias, Tobias, Judith, Hester, Job, Psalter of one hundred and fifty Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Isaiah, Jeremiah with Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, twelve lesser Prophets, that is, Osee, &c., two books of the Maccabees, the I. and II. Of the New Testament, the four Gospels, &c. as ours. But if any one doth not receive all these books, with every part of them, as they use to be read in the catholic (viz. the Roman) church, and as they are contained in the ancient vulgar Latin edition, for holy and canonical, and shall knowingly contemn the foresaid traditions, let him be *anathema*."

Secondly, we say that original sin is the fault and corruption of every man, none excepted, art. IX; but they say, [s] "But this synod declares it is not their intention to comprehend the blessed and unspotted Virgin Mary the mother of God in this decree, where it treats of original sin."

---

[r] Sacrorum vero librorum indicem huic decreto ascribendum censuit (synodus), ne cui dubitatio suboriri possit, quinam sunt qui ab ipsa synodo suscipiuntur. Sunt vero infrascripti: Testamenti veteris quinque Moysi, id est, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium, Joshue, Judicum, Ruth, quatuor Regum, duo Paralipomenon, Esdræ primus et secundus, qui dicitur Nehemias, Tobias, Judith, Hester, Job, Psalterium Davidicum 150 Psalmorum, Parabolæ, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Hieremias cum Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, duodecim Prophetæ minores, id est, Osee, &c., duo Macchabæorum primus et secundus. Testamenti Novi quatuor Evangelia, &c. Si quis autem libros ipsos integros, cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ecclesia catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones prædictas sciens et prudens contempserit, anathema sit. Concil. Trident. Ses. 4. [Ibid. p. 22.]

Thirdly, we say we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ by faith, and so justified by faith only, art. XI; but they say, [t] "If any one say that a sinner is justified by faith only, that he so understand that nothing else is required to attain the grace of justification, and that it is noways necessary that he should be prepared and disposed by the motion of his own will, let him be *anathema*."

Fourthly, we say that works before justification have the nature of sin, art. XIII; but they say, [u] "If any one say, that all the works that are done before justification, howsoever they are done, are truly sins, or deserve the hatred of God, let him be *anathema*."

Fifthly, we say Christ was alone without sin, art. XV; they, that the Virgin Mary also was: [x] "If any one say, that a man being once justified can sin no more, nor lose his grace, and therefore he who falls and sins was never truly justified; or on the contrary, that he can avoid through his whole life all even venial sins, unless by a special privilege from God, as the church holdeth concerning the blessed Virgin, let him be *anathema*."

Sixthly, we say the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images as relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God, art. XXII; but they, [y] "seeing the catholic church taught by the Holy Ghost out of the holy scriptures, and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, in holy councils, and last of all in this general synod, hath taught that there is a purgatory, and that souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the sacrifices of the acceptable altar; this holy synod commands the bishops, that they would diligently study, that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory, delivered from the holy Fathers and sacred councils, be by Christ's faithful people believed, held, taught and preached every where." And again: [z] "This holy synod commands all bishops and others, that have the charge and care of teaching, that according to the use of the catholic and apostolic church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and the consent of the holy Fathers, and the decrees of sacred councils, especially concerning the intercession and invocation of saints, the honour of relics, and the lawful use of images, they diligently instruct the faithful, teaching that the saints reigning together with Christ do offer up their prayers to God for men, and that it is good and profitable simply to invocate and pray unto them, &c. And that the bodies of the holy martyrs and others that live with Christ are to be worshipped, &c. And also that images of Christ, the God-bearing Virgin, and other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and that due honour and veneration be given to them." And presently, [a] "But if any teach or think any thing contrary to these decrees, let him be *anathema*."

---

[s] Declarat tamen hæc ipsa synodus non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam Dei genitricem. Ibid. Ses. 5. [p. 29.]

[t] Si quis dixerit sola fide impium justificari, ut ita intelligat nihil aliud requiri quod ad justificationis gratiam consequendam cooperetur, et nulla ex parte necesse esse eum suæ voluntatis motu præparari atque disponi, anathema sit. Ses. 6. Can. 9.

[u] Si quis dixerit opera omnia quæ ante justificationem fiunt, quacunque ratione facta sint, vere esse peccata, vel odium Dei mereri, &c. anathema sit. Ibid. Can. 7.

[x] Si quis hominem semel justificatum dixerit amplius peccare non posse, neque gratiam amittere, atque adeo eum qui labitur et peccat nunquam vere fuisse justificatum; aut contra, posse in tota vita peccata omnia etiam venialia vitare, nisi ex speciali privilegio quemadmodum de beata Virgine tenet ecclesia, anathema sit. Ibid. can. 23.

---

[y] Cum catholica ecclesia Spiritu S. edocta, ex sacris literis et antiqua patrum traditione, in sacris conciliis et novissime in hac œcumenica synodo docuerit purgatorium esse; animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabilis altaris sacrificio juvari, præcipit S. synodus episcopis, ut sanam de purgatorio doctrinam a sanctis patribus et sacris conciliis traditam, a Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, et ubique prædicari, diligenter studeant. Ibid. Ses. 25. [p. 167.]

[z] Mandat sancta synodus omnibus episcopis et cæteris docendi munus curamque sustinentibus, ut juxta catholicæ et apostolicæ ecclesiæ usum, a primævis Christianæ religionis temporibus receptum, sanctorumque patrum consensionem et sacrorum conciliorum decreta, inprimis de sanctorum intercessione, invocatione, reliquiarum honore, et legitimo imaginum usu, fideles diligenter instruant; docentes eos, sanctos una cum Christo regnantes orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre, bonum atque utile esse simpliciter eos invocare, &c. Sanctorum quoque martyrum et aliorum cum Christo viventium corpora, &c. veneranda esse, &c. Imagines porro Christi, Deiparæ Virginis, et aliorum sanctorum in templis præsertim habendas et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam. Ibid.

Seventhly, we say it is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive church, to have public prayer in the church, or to administer the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people, art. XXIV; but they, [b] "If any one say that the custom of the church of Rome, whereby part of the canon and the words of consecration are uttered with a low voice, is to be condemned, or that mass ought to be celebrated only in the vulgar tongue, or that water ought not to be mixed with the wine that is to be offered in the cup, let him be *anathema*."

Eighthly, we say there are but two sacraments, art. XXV; they, [c] "If any one say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that there are more or less than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, or that any of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be *anathema*."

Ninthly, we say, transubstantiation is repugnant to the scripture, and overthroweth the nature of the sacrament, art. XXVIII; but they, [d] "But because Christ our Redeemer said, that that which he offered under the shape of bread was truly his body, therefore it was always believed in the church of God, and last of all this holy synod doth now declare it, that by the consecration of bread and wine is made the changing of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of wine into the substance of his blood; which change is fitly and properly called by the holy catholic church *transubstantiation*."

---

[a] Si quis autem his decretis contraria docuerit, aut senserit, anathema sit. Ibid.

[b] Si quis dixerit ecclesiæ Romanæ ritum, quo summissa voce pars canonis et verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse, aut lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere, aut aquam non miscendam esse vino in calice offerendo, eo quod sit contra Christi institutionem, anathema sit. Ibid. Sess. 22. Can. 9.

[c] Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet, baptismum, confirmationem, eucharistiam, pœnitentiam, extremam unctionem, ordinem, et matrimonium, aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum, anathema sit. Ibid. Ses. 7. Can. 1.

[d] Quoniam autem Christus redemptor noster corpus suum, id quod sub specie panis offerebat, vere esse dixit, ideo persuasum semper in ecclesia Dei fuit, idque nunc denique sancta hæc synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus, quæ conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta catholica ecclesia transubstantiatio dicitur. Ibid. Sess. 13. Can. 4.

Tenthly, we say the sacrament of our Lord's supper is not to be worshipped, art. XXVIII; but they, [e] "There is therefore no place of doubting left, but that all the faithful of Christ, according to the custom always received in the catholic church, should give to this most holy sacrament, in the adoration of it, that worship of service which is due to the true God."

Eleventhly, we say the cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people, art. XXX; but they, [f] "If any one say that from the command of God and the necessity of salvation, all and every believer in Christ ought to receive both kinds of the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, let him be *anathema*."

Twelfthly, we say, the sacrifices of mass are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits, art. XXXI; but they, [g] "If any one say that in the mass there is not a true and proper sacrifice offered to God, or that to be offered is nothing else but for Christ to be given to us to eat, let him be *anathema*."

There are many other things wherein the doctrine established by the church of Rome contradicteth ours, as about the marriage of priests, &c.: but these may be enough to shew both the falseness of that calumny that ignorant people put upon our church of England, as if it was returning to popery, whereas the doctrine established by our church doth in so many and plain terms contradict the established doctrine of theirs; and also it shews the truth of this part of our doctrine, that some part of theirs is false. For seeing whatsoever is here set down as the doctrine of our church is grounded upon scripture, consented to by reason, and delivered by the Fathers, it cannot but be true doctrine: and seeing theirs doth so frequently contradict ours, it cannot but in such things that are so contradictory to ours be false doctrine. And therefore we may well conclude, that even the church of Rome too hath erred, yea, in matters of faith, and that if she denies it, she must add that to the rest of her errors.

---

[e] Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur quin omnes Christi fideles, pro more in ecclesia catholica semper recepto, latriæ cultum qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant. Ibid. c. 5. V. et Can. 6.

[f] Si quis dixerit ex Dei præcepto vel necessitate salutis omnes et singulos Christi fideles utramque speciem sanctissimi eucharistiæ sacramenti sumere debere, anathema sit. Sess. 21. Can. 1. V. et Can. 2.

[g] Si quis dixerit in missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari, anathema sit. Ibid. Sess. 22. Can. 1.

ARTICLE XX.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

The church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith.

AFTER the nature of the church described, here we have the authority of the church asserted; which authority extendeth itself to two things, to the decreeing of ceremonies, and to the determining of controversies. And truly this article is very fitly inserted amongst the rest; for had not the church this power, this convocation in particular which composed these Articles would have had no power or authority to have composed them, there being several rites decreed, and many controversies decided in them. And therefore was it a great act of prudence in their determining of controversies, to determine this controversy in particular, that they had power to determine controversies; that this controversy being determined, that they had power to determine controversies, all the other controversies determined by them might be the better relished and received by them for whose sakes they were determined.

But this by the bye. What they here determine concerning the authority of the church (spoken of in the foregoing article) is, that "the church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith." First, it hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, so that it is lawful for the church to decree and appoint what rites or ceremonies shall be used in the public worship of the great God; not as parts of that worship[a], for then they would not be rites and ceremonies. And therefore it is in vain objected by the adversaries to this truth, that herein we give the church power to add any thing to God's worship which is not commanded in his word; as if rites and ceremonies were in themselves any part of worship; whereas what is any part of God's worship cannot be a mere rite and ceremony; neither can that which is a mere rite or ceremony be any part of his worship. For rites and ceremonies, in that they are nothing but rites and ceremonies, be in themselves indifferent, neither good nor bad, until determined by the church; after which determination also they still remain indifferent in themselves, and are good and bad only in reference to their decree who had power and authority to determine them; whereas every the least part of God's worship, in that it is a part of God's worship, can be by no means omitted without sin. And therefore, when it is here said that the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, we must always by the words rites or ceremonies understand nothing else but the particular circumstances and customs to be observed in the service and worship of God, not as any cause or part thereof.

---

[a] Indeed it is impossible that mere rites and ceremonies should be any part of God's worship, properly so called; for the worship of God doth properly consist in the exercise of graces and virtues. In quo quid

Secondly, as the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, so hath it authority also in controversies of faith. So that whensoever any controversies arise in the church of God concerning any of the articles of faith delivered in the holy scriptures, as, whether Christ be God and man in the same person, whether justification be by faith only or by works also, or the like; the church hath power and authority to decide the controversy, and to determine which side of the question is most agreeable to the word of God. And that

aliud mandatur, nisi ut ei quantum potest commendet diligendum Deum? Hic est Dei cultus, hæc vera religio, hæc recta pietas, hæc tantum Deo debita servitus. Aug. de civitate Dei, l. 10. c. [3.] And the worship of God thus consisting in the loving of him and exercising other graces upon him, no outward circumstances can be any real parts of his worship, that being seated principally in the heart. Whence St. Chrysostome saith of prayer as an act of worship, Ἀλλὰ κᾂν γόνατα μὴ κλίνῃς, κᾂν μὴ στῆθος τύψῃς, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνατείνῃς, διάνοιαν δὲ μόνον ἐπιδείξῃ θερμὴν τὸ πᾶν ἀπήρτισας τῆς εὐχῆς. Chrysost. εἰς τὴν Ἄνναν λογ. ε΄. [vol. V. p. 77.] So we may say of all other acts of worship, that it is the heart that is the principal seat of it. And therefore all outward rites and circumstances upon that very account, because they are outward rites and circumstances, cannot be any part of true and proper worship.

the church hath this power in decreeing ceremonies, and this authority in deciding controversies, is plain and manifest.

First, from scripture, where we find St. Paul writing to the church of Corinth, to see that *all things be done to edifying*, 1 Cor. xiv. 26, and that *all things be done decently and in order*, ver. 40. Now unless the church of Corinth had power and authority to decree and determine what was edifying, what was decent and orderly, St. Paul would here counsel them to what was impossible or unlawful for them to do. It was impossible for them to see that all things were done to edifying and in order, until they had first decreed what was thus edifying and orderly; and it was unlawful for them to decree it, unless they had power and authority to do it. As for example, whether it was more decent and edifying in their meetings for one to speak after another, or for many to speak together; whether it was more decent and edifying in their breaking of bread for every one to use a different, or for all to use one and the same posture. In these and the like cases, unless they had power to determine what was the most orderly and edifying, St. Paul commanded what was in itself unlawful. But seeing that is blasphemy to say, we must needs grant that the church of Corinth (and so other churches) had power and authority to determine and order these things. Or if they had no such power before, yet St. Paul, or rather the most high God by St. Paul, did in these words grant them such a power and authority, in the decreeing these and the like circumstances and ceremonies, for the more decent and orderly worshipping of the glorious Jehovah, giving them this [b] one general comprehensive rule, *Let all things be done to edifying and in order;* out of which one general rule that and all churches whatsoever, according to the variety of times and places they live in, were to frame other particular rules and canons for the edifying and orderly performance of God's worship; who being a God not of confusion but of order in himself, he requires such worship as is done in order, not in confusion, from us.

---

[b] *Omnia decenter et ordine*. Conclusio generalior, quæ non modo breviter totum statum, sed etiam singulas partes complectitur. Imo regula est ad quam omnia, quæ ad externam politiam spectant, exigere convenit. Quoniam sparsim disseruerat de ritibus, omnia hic colligere voluit in brevem summam, nempe ut decorum servetur, et vitetur confusio. Calv. in loc. Hic ergo locus rite expensus discrimen ostendet inter tyrannica papæ edicta, quæ conscientias premunt dira servitute, et pias ecclesiæ leges, quibus disciplina et ordo continetur. Quinetiam hinc colligere promptum est, has posteriores non esse habendas pro humanis traditionibus, quandoquidem fundatæ sunt in hoc generali mandato, et liquidam approbationem habent quasi ex ore Christi ipsius. Ibid.

But this makes only for the church's power in decreeing ceremonies. But now as for her authority in determining controversies of faith, I think it is plainly and clearly grounded upon and deduced from the practice of the apostles themselves; amongst whom there arising a controversy, whether it was needful to circumcise the Gentiles and to command them to keep the law of Moses, they presently met together to consider of the matter, Acts xv. 5, 6. And here we see, a controversy being raised, no particular person undertakes the determination of it, but several of them met together, and so made up a council, which was then, as it is now, the representative of the whole church. Well, the church in her representatives being thus met together, they spent some time in disputing about the business, ver. 7, but at last they decide the controversy, ver. 19, 20. From whence we may, yea must certainly conclude, that the church had then power and authority in controversies of faith; otherwise it durst not have undertaken the decision of so great a one as it did. And if it had that power then, it cannot be denied to have the same still; for it is the same church now that it was then, governed by the same Head now as it was then, directed by the same Spirit now that it was then, enjoys the same scriptures to decide controversies by now as it did then, and therefore cannot be denied to have the same power in decision of controversies now as it had then. Nay, for mine own part, I cannot but look upon the manner of the determination of this controversy intended for a model for the determination of all controversies in after-ages. The apostles were all acted with an infallible spirit, and therefore, one should have thought, might have put a period to that controversy without so many disputes about it, or without calling a council, or the whole church together, for the decision of it. But howsoever, God, to shew that it was not into the hands of private persons, but of the church in general, he had committed the determination of all controversies of faith, would not suffer his apostles themselves to end it without the consent of the whole church, or howsoever the greater part of it, which is accounted as the whole. So that it was by the whole church that that controversy was decided, to shew that the church had power to decide controversies.

Neither can I see in reason how this power in ceremonies and controversies should be denied the church. For first, as for ceremonies, they cannot but be acknowledged to be indifferent, neither in themselves good nor bad; and if they be in themselves either good or bad, and not indifferent, they are not merely ceremonies; especially if they be in their own nature bad and sinful, they are not the ceremonies intended in this place. For this same article in the following part of it doth determine that the ceremonies here intended are only such as are not against the scripture, and by consequence not unlawful. Now such rites and ceremonies as are in themselves indifferent, it can be no sin to determine them to either part: for which part soever they are determined to, they cannot be determined into sin; I mean what is in itself indifferent, and so may be used or not used without sin; whether it be decreed to be used or not to be used, it cannot be any sinful decree; especially when after as well as before the decree they are still acknowledged to be in themselves indifferent, though not as to our use. Which things of indifferency also, as all ceremonies are, cannot be supposed to come within the command of God, for then they would not be indifferent; and seeing God hath not left any particular command, but only a general rule about all things of indifferency, that they be so ordered that they be done decently and to edifying, the church cannot be thought to sin in determining them so as she thinks is the most edifying and decent; as we shall by the blessing of God see more fully in the thirty-fourth article. And if it be no sin thus for the church to determine ceremonies, it must needs be granted that she hath power to decree them.

But the truth of her power in decreeing ceremonies doth appear also in her authority to determine controversies: for if she hath authority to determine controversies, she must needs have a power also to decree ceremonies. For controversies of faith are of a higher nature than rites and ceremonies; and if it be lawful for her to do the greater, it cannot be unlawful to do the less, especially where the less is included in the greater, as it is in this case. For there are few or no rites or ceremonies decreed but what are first controverted; and if it be in the power of the church to determine all controversies, it must be in her power to determine such controversies in particular as arise concerning ceremonies.

But now that the church hath authority in controversies, is a truth which should it not be granted, it would be impossible for any controversies to be ever ended. I know the [e]scripture is the rule of faith, and the supreme judge of all controversies whatsoever, so that there is no controversy of faith ought to be determined but from the scriptures. But I know also, that as all controversies of faith are to be determined by the scripture, so there are no controversies of faith but what are grounded upon the scriptures. What is not grounded upon the scriptures I cannot be bound to believe, and by consequence it cannot be any controversy of faith. Hence it is, that as there is scarce an article of our Christian religion but hath been some time controverted, so there is no controversy that ever arose about it but still both parties have pretended to scripture. As for example, that great controversy betwixt Arius and Athanasius, whether Christ was very God of the same substance with the Father. Arius, he pretended to scripture in that controversy as well as Athanasius: and so for all other controversies, both sides still make as if the scripture was for them. Now in such cases the question is, how the question must be decided, whether the scripture is for the one or for the other side of the controversy. The scripture itself cannot decide the controversy, for the controversy is concerning itself: the parties engaged in the controversy cannot decide it, for either of them thinks his own opinion to be grounded upon scripture. Now how can this question be decided better or [f] otherways, than by the whole church's exposition of the scripture, which side of the controversy it is for, and which side it is against? That it is lawful for the church thus to expound the scripture is plain; for it is lawful even for every particular person to pass his judgment upon any place of scripture: otherwise the [g] Bereans would not have been commended for searching the scriptures to see whether those things which the apostles preached were so or no, Acts xvii. And if the particular persons which the church consisteth of may give the exposition of the scripture, much more the church itself, that consisteth of those particular persons. And as the exposition that any particular person passeth upon the scripture is binding to that person, so that he is bound to believe and act according to it; so whatsoever exposition of scripture is made by the church in general, it is binding to the church in general: of which more elsewhere. And if the church hath this power and authority to expound the scriptures, it hath power and authority also to determine controversies. For the determination of all controversies depends only upon the exposition of the scriptures; according as the scripture is expounded, all controversies are determined. So that which side soever of the controversy the scripture so expounded makes for, that is to be acknowledged as the truth, and the other to be rejected as an error. And therefore seeing the church cannot be denied to have power to expound the scriptures, it must needs be granted to have authority in controversies of faith.

---

[e] The Fathers do frequently call the scriptures the canon or rule of faith. Scriptura sancta doctrinæ nostræ regulam figit. Aug. de bono viduitatis, [2. vol. VI.] *Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον ὑπὲρ μὲν χρημάτων μὴ ἑτέροις πιστεύειν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀριθμῷ, καὶ ψήφῳ τοῦτο ἐπιτρέπειν, ὑπὲρ δὲ πραγμάτων ψηφιζομένους ἁπλῶς ταῖς ἑτέρων παρασύρεσθαι δόξαις, καὶ ταῦτα ἀκριβῆ ζυγὸν ἁπάντων ἔχοντας, καὶ γνώμονα, καὶ κανόνα, τῶν θείων νόμων τὴν ἀπόφασιν;* Chrysost. in 2 Corinth. Hom. 13. fi. [vol. III. p. 624.] *Ὅτι δὲ ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει, τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας, τὰς θείας φημὶ γραφὰς, κατοπτεύσομεν.* Isidor. Pelusiot. Epist. 114. l. 4. And therefore Athanasius having numbered all the books of the New Testament, saith, *Τοσαῦτα καὶ τὰ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης βιβλία, τάδε κανονιζόμενα, καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, οἱονεὶ ἀκροθίνια ἢ ἄγκυραι καὶ ἐρείσματα.* Athan. Synops. S. Script. [vol. II. p. 131.] And Ruffinus, Hæc sunt quæ patres intra canonem concluserunt, ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt. Ruffin. in exp. sym. [p. 26.]

---

[f] Thus Constantine in his Letter to the Churches saith, There was no other way to allay the controversies and settle the unity of the faith, but only by the church itself meeting in a general council for the same purpose. *Πεῖραν λαβὼν*, saith he, *ἐκ τῆς τῶν κοινῶν εὐπραξίας, ὅση τῆς θείας δυνάμεως πέφυκε χάρις, τοῦτο πρόγε πάντων ἔκρινα μοὶ προσήκειν σκοπεῖν, ὅπως παρὰ τοῖς μακαριωτάτοις τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας πλήθεσι πίστις μία, καὶ εἰλικρινὴς ἀγάπη, ὁμογνώμων τε περὶ τὸν παγκρατῆ θεὸν εὐσέβεια τηρῆται· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τοῦτ' οὐχ οἷόν τ' ἦν, ἀκλινῆ καὶ βεβαίαν τάξιν λαβεῖν, εἰ μὴ εἰς ταυτὸ πάντων ὁμοῦ ἢ τῶν γοῦν πλειόνων ἐπισκόπων συνελθόντων ἑκάστου, τῶν προσηκόντων τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ θρεσκείᾳ διάκρισις γένοιτο.* Euseb. de vita Constantini, l. 3. c [17.] And Innocent bishop of Rome, in his Letter to the Clergy of Constantinople, *Ἀλλὰ τί κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων νῦν ἐν τῷ παρόντι ποιήσωμεν; ἀναγκαῖα ἐστὶ διάγνωσις συνοδικὴ, ἣν καὶ πάλαι ἔφημεν συναθροιστέαν· μόνη γάρ ἐστιν ἥτις δύναται τὰς κινήσεις τῶν τοιούτων καταστεῖλαι καταιγίδων.* Soz. l. 8. c. 26.

[g] Thus St. Chrysostome observes the Bereans searched the scriptures, that they might know of themselves whether those things were so or no. *Καὶ ὅρα οὐχ ἁπλῶς, ἀλλὰ μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἀνηρεύνων τὰς γραφάς· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἀνέκρινον, βουλόμενοι ἀπ' αὐτῶν πληροφορίαν μᾶλλον περὶ τοῦ πάθους λαβεῖν.* Chrysost. in Act. Hom. 37. [vol. IV. p. 815.]

And this is that which St. Augustine taught long ago. [h] "Furthermore," saith he, "although there is no certain example can be brought out of the canonical scriptures of this thing, yet in this very thing do we hold the truth, when we do that which pleaseth the whole church, which the authority of the scriptures themselves commendeth; that seeing the holy scripture cannot deceive, whosoever fears to be deceived in the obscurity of this question, (whether heretics are to be again baptized,) let him consult the same church concerning it, which the scripture demonstrateth without any ambiguity." As if he should say, In doubtful things, where the scripture is not so clear, consult the church; for though the question in hand be not clearly decided in the scriptures, yet this is clearly delivered in the scriptures, that the church hath power and authority to decide such questions.

But if any one still doubteth about this the authority of the church, let him but consider how the church hath exercised this authority almost ever since it was a church. What council was ever called but it either decreed ceremonies or determined controversies? and what the council doth, the whole church is said to do: whence Athanasius saith, [i] "For the faith which the council confesseth in writing is the faith of the catholic church." So that I might demonstrate the truth of this article from the constant practice of the church in all ages, whensoever met together in council. But I shall insist only upon the council of Nice: and certainly if ever the whole church of Christ met together since the apostles' times, it was there. [k] "For here," as Eusebius saith, "the principal of the ministers of God of all the churches that filled Europe, Libya, and Asia were met together." So that as Theodoret saith, [l] "There were three hundred and eighteen bishops assembled." Sozomen saith, [m] "There were about three hundred and twenty bishops, and of presbyters and deacons it seems accompanying of them no small multitude." Nay, Socrates saith, [n] "That the presbyters, deacons, and sub-deacons that followed them could not be numbered." And therefore whatsoever this council did, it must needs be granted to be done by the church of Christ.

---

[h] Proinde quamvis hujus rei certum de scripturis canonicis non proferatur exemplum, earundem tamen scripturarum etiam in hac re a nobis tenetur veritas, cum hoc facimus, quod universæ jam placuit ecclesiæ, quam ipsarum scripturarum commendat autoritas: ut, quoniam sancta scriptura fallere non potest, quisquis falli metuit hujus obscuritate quæstionis, eandem ecclesiam de illa consulat, quam sine ulla ambiguitate sancta scriptura demonstrat. Aug. contra Cresc. grammat. l. 1. [39. vol. IX.]

[i] *Ἣν γὰρ ἡ σύνοδος ἐγγράφως ὡμολόγησε πίστιν, αὕτη τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐστί.* Athanas. in syn. Nic. contra hær. Arrian. decret. [27. vol. I. p. 233.]

But what was the reason of the church's meeting in so glorious a manner? Why, it is very observable, that it was for the decreeing of a ceremony, and determining of a controversy. For Socrates saith, [o] "For neither were Alexander nor Arius mollified by the letters of the emperor, and there was a great strife and tumult also among the people. And there was also another grievance in some places troubling the churches, viz. the difference about keeping the feast of Easter, which was only in the eastern parts; some striving to have the feast celebrated after the manner of the Jews, others following all Christians over the world." And presently, [p] "The emperor therefore seeing the church much troubled by both these things, he gathered together an œcumenical or general council, desiring by his letters the bishops from all places to meet at Nice, a city in Bithynia." And so Athanasius: [q]"But if any one would discern betwixt the cause of the Nicene and of those other councils which were after it, he shall find that there was a reasonable cause why the Nicene council should be called, but the others were forcibly gathered together out of hatred and contention. For the Nicene council was gathered together by reason of the Arian heresy, and the difference about Easter, because the Syrians, Cilicians, and Mesopotamians differed from us, and celebrated the passover at the same time that the Jews do." So that it was plainly for the deciding of the controversy of Arius, and the time of the celebrating of Easter, that the church met at this time; the first of which was clearly a controversy of faith, the other a mere rite or ceremony. And certainly if the church had not then had according to this article power to decree rites, and authority in matters of faith, they would never have travelled from all parts of the world to Nice to exercise such a power.

---

[k] *Τῶν γοῦν ἐκκλησιῶν ἁπασῶν, αἱ τὴν Εὐρώπην ἅπασαν Λιβύην τε καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐπλήρουν, ὁμοῦ συνῆκτο τῶν τοῦ θειοῦ λειτουργῶν ἀκροθίνια.* Euseb. de vita Constant. l. 3. c. [7.]

[l] *Ὀκτὼ καὶ δέκα δὲ καὶ τριακόσιοι συνῆλθον ἀρχιερεῖς.* Theodoret. Hist. eccles. l. 1. c. 7.

[m] *Ἦσαν δὲ ἐπίσκοποι ὑπὲρ ἀμφὶ τριακόσιοι εἴκοσι, πρεσβυτέρων δὲ καὶ διακόνων ὡς εἰκὸς ἑπομένων οὐκ ἦν ὀλίγον πλῆθος.* Sozom. Hist. l. 1. c. [17.]

[n] *Ἑπομένων δὲ τούτοις πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων, ἀκολούθων τε πλειόνων ὅσων ἑτέρων οὐδὲ ἦν ἀριθμός.* Socrat. Hist. l. 1. c. [8.]

[o] *Οὔτε γὰρ Ἀλέξανδρος οὔτε Ἄρειος ὑπὲρ τῶν γραφέντων ἐμαλάσσοντο· ἀλλὰ τὶς ἦν ἄκριτος καὶ παρὰ τοῖς λαοῖς ἔρις καὶ ταραχή· προϋπῆρχε δὲ καὶ ἄλλη τὶς προτέρα νόσος τοπικὴ τὰς ἐκκλησίας ταράττουσα, ἡ διαφωνία τῆς τοῦ πάσχα ἑορτῆς, ἥτις περὶ τὰ τῆς ἑώας μέρη μόνον ἐγένετο, τῶν μὲν Ἰουδαϊκώτερον τὴν ἑορτὴν ποιεῖν ἐσπουδακότων· τῶν δὲ μιμουμένων σύμπαντας τοὺς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Χριστιανούς.* Socrat. Hist. l. 1. c. [8.]

[p] *Δι' ἀμφότερα τοίνυν ὁρῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς ταραττομένην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, σύνοδον οἰκουμενικὴν συνεκρότει, τοὺς πανταχόθεν ἐπισκόπους διὰ γραμμά-*

But perhaps, whilst they were at home by themselves, they might think they had such a power; but did they think so when they were come all together? Yes, certainly: for they put this their power and authority into execution. "For," as Eusebius saith, [r]"the question being made concerning the most holy feast of Easter, it seemed by common consent to be right that all should celebrate it upon one and the same day." Which made Athanasius say, [s]"But thanks be to the

---

των εἰς Νικαίαν τῆς Βιθυνίας ἀπαντῆσαι παρακαλῶν. Ibid.

[q] *Ἄντε τὸ αἴτιον τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ, καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτὴν τοσούτων γενομένων συνόδων παρὰ τούτων διαγνῶσαί τις ἐθέλοι· εὕροι ἂν τὴν μὲν ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἔχουσαν τὸ αἴτιον εὔλογον, τὰς δὲ ἄλλας διὰ μῖσος καὶ φιλονεικίαν ἐκ βίας συγκροτηθείσας· ἡ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν καὶ διὰ τὸ πάσχα συνήχθη, ἐπειδὴ οἱ κατὰ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν καὶ Μεσοποταμίαν διεφώνουν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ τῷ καιρῷ ἐν ᾧ ποιοῦσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐποίουν καὶ αὐτοί.* Athan. Epist. ad episcop. Africanos, [2. vol. I. p. 892.]

[r] *Ἔνθα καὶ περὶ τῆς τοῦ πάσχα ἁγιωτάτης ἑορτῆς γενομένης ζητήσεως, ἔδοξε κοινῇ γνώμῃ καλῶς ἔχειν ἐπὶ μιᾶς ἡμέρας πάντας τοὺς ἁπανταχοῦ ἐπιτελεῖν.* Euseb. in vita Constantini, l. 3. c. [18.]

[s] *Ἀλλὰ χάρις τῷ κυρίῳ, ὥσπερ περὶ τῆς πίστεως, οὕτως καὶ περὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἑορτῆς γέγονε συμφωνία.* Athan. Epist. ad episc. African. [2.]

Lord, we are all agreed concerning the faith and holy feast." Nay, not content with decreeing it, they (or Eusebius for them) declare also their power and authority to do it, in these words: [t] "For it is lawful for us to lay aside their rite and custom, and in a truer order and institution, (which we have observed from the first day of the passion unto this present,) to propagate the celebration of this feast to future ages." Neither did they declare they had power to decree this ceremony only, but others also; and therefore in their sixth canon they decree, [u] "That ancient rites and customs should be observed."

Neither did they only decree the ceremony, but decide the controversy also they met about. For the council itself sent a letter to several churches, wherein, as Socrates relates it, they say, [v] "First of all therefore the wicked and perverse opinions of Arius and his complices were laid open before the most holy emperor Constantine, and with one consent they saw good to anathematize or curse his wicked opinion, and his blasphemous words and names, saying, 'The Son of God was of nothing, and there was a time when he was not, and that the Son of God is by freedom of will capable of good or evil, and that he is a creature, and made.' All these things did the holy synod anathematize." And as Sozomen saith, [x] "But you must know that the council determined, that the Son was of the same substance with the Father." As we may also see in the Creed set forth and confirmed by them.

And thus we see how the church of God, met together in the most renowned council that ever was since the apostles' time, did exercise this power in decreeing rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith. I might shew the same thing in many other particulars in this and other councils; but this may be enough to convince any one, that doth not think himself wiser than the whole church of God was at that time, that *the church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith.*

---

[t] *Ἔξεστι γὰρ τοῦ ἐκείνων ἔθους ἀποβληθέντος, ἀληθεστέρᾳ τάξει, ἣν ἐκ πρώτης τοῦ πάθους ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ παρόντος ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μελλοντας αἰῶνας τὴν τῆς ἐπιτηρήσεως ταύτης συμπλήρωσιν ἐκτείνεσθαι.* Euseb. in vit. Constant. l. 3. c. [18.]

[u] Τὰ *ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω.* Concil. Nic. can. 6. [vol. I.]

[v] Π*ρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐξ ἁπάντων ἐξητάσθη τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀσσέβειαν καὶ τὴν παρανομίαν* Ἀ*ρείου, καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ, ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως* Κ*ωνσταντίνου, καὶ παμψηφεὶ ἔδοξεν ἀναθεματισθῆναι τὴν ἀσεβῆ αὐτοῦ δόξαν, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τὰ βλάσφημα, τὸν* Υ*ἱὸν τοῦ* Θ*εοῦ λέγων ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, καὶ εἶναι πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ αὐτεξουσιότητι κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν τὸν* Υ*ἱὸν τοῦ* Θ*εοῦ, καὶ κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα· ἅπαντα ἀναθεμάτισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος.* Socrat. Hist. l. 1. c. [9.]

[x] Ἰ*στέον δὲ ὅτι τὸν μὲν* Υ*ἱὸν ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ* Π*ατρὶ ἀπεφήναντο.* Sozom. Hist. l. 1. c. [21.] V. et Niceph. l. 8. c. [17,] 18.

And yet it is not lawful for the church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it so expound one place of scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the church be a witness and keeper of holy writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.

The authority of the church being asserted in the former part of this article, here are three excellent rules laid down to be observed in her execution of that authority in this; which being all so plain of themselves, I need but touch upon them. And the first is, that it doth not ordain any thing contrary to God's word written, contrary to the scriptures which are the written word of God. Which is a necessary rule to be observed in all decrees and constitutions whatsoever. For [y] *though we, or an angel from heaven,* saith the apostle, *preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed,* Gal. i. 8. The word of God is a constant rule for all decrees whatsoever to be framed by.

[y] Quicquid dicat quis, conferendum est cum scripturis, quas non ab homine, neque per hominem, sed a Spiritu Sancto per revelationem Jesu Christi acceperunt ut loquerentur et scriberent homines sancti. *Et licet nos aut angelus de cœlo evangelizet vobis, præter id quod accepistis, anathema sit,* et iterum anathema sit. Hoc dictum, hæc sententia similiter omnium illorum est, qui neque ab homine, neque per hominem acceperunt, sed per Spiritum S. Unde scripturæ illorum omnes solæ canonicæ dicuntur et sunt. Rupert. in Mat. l. 7. [vol. II. p. 62.] Καὶ μάλα εἰκότως· οἱ γὰρ ἄγγελοι, κἂν μεγάλοι, ἀλλὰ δοῦλοι καὶ λειτουργοὶ τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες· αἱ δὲ γραφαὶ πᾶσαι οὐ παρὰ δούλων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ τῶν ὅλων δεσπότου γραφεῖσαι ἐπέμφθησαν. Chrysost. in Gal. i. v. 9. [vol. III. p. 718.]

What agrees with it is a lawful decree, yea therefore lawful because it agrees with it; and so what is contrary to it is a sinful decree, yea therefore sinful because contrary to it. For the word of God, in that it is the word of God, cannot but be true, yea truth itself. And it being impossible that both parts of a contradiction should be true, and certain that that part which the word delivers is always true, whatsoever is contrary to the scripture cannot but be false, yea therefore false because contrary to the scriptures. And as the word of God, in that it is the word of God, must needs be true, so the law of God, in that it is the law of God, must needs be lawful; and so whatsoever is contrary to it cannot but be unlawful; nay, therefore it cannot but be unlawful because contrary to the law of God. So that the scriptures are always to be acknowledged to be the rule both of our faith and manners, and the supreme judge according to whose sentence all opinions must either stand or fall. And therefore, though the church hath authority to decree rites and decide controversies of faith, yet it is not lawful, nay it is sinful for her to decree the one and decide the other contrary to the scriptures; it being a sin to decree sin, and whatsoever is contrary to the scriptures must needs be a sin, because it is contrary to the scriptures. And therefore St. Basil saith, [a]"That such hearers as are instructed in the scriptures ought to examine those things that are spoken by their teachers, and to receive such things as are consonant to the scriptures, but to reject such things as are contrary to them, and by all means to turn away from those that persist in such doctrines." And St. Chrysostom: [b]"But if we say we ought to believe the scriptures, and they are simple and true, it is easy for thee to judge. If any one agrees with them, he is a Christian; if any one contradicts them, he is far from that canon." [c] "We ought therefore," saith Origen, "for the testimony of the words we produce in doctrine, to produce the sense of the scripture, as it were confirming the sense that we expound." And elsewhere: [d] "But afterwards, as it is his custom, the apostle will confirm what he hath said from the holy scriptures, setting also before the doctors of the church an example, that in those things which they speak to the people they do not utter what is presumed upon in their own opinions, but what is strengthened by divine testimony: for if he, such and so great an apostle, did not believe that the authority of his words could be sufficient, unless he shews that what he saith is written in the Law and the Prophets, how much more we, the weakest of creatures, ought to observe this, that when we teach, we should not produce our own, but the doctrines of the Holy Spirit!" And if in our teaching we ought constantly to follow the scriptures, and whatsoever is contrary to the scriptures ought to be abhorred, it must needs follow, that the church cannot ordain, decree, or so much as teach any thing contrary to the scriptures.

---

[a] *Ὅτι δεῖ τῶν ἀκροατῶν τοὺς πεπαιδευμένους τὰς γραφὰς δοκιμάζειν τὰ παρὰ τῶν διδασκάλων λεγόμενα· καὶ τὰ μὲν σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς δέχεσθαι, τὰ δὲ ἀλλότρια ἀποβάλλειν· καὶ τοὺς τοιούτοις διδάγμασιν ἐπιμένοντας ἀποστρέφεσθαι σφοδρότερον.* Basil. Moral. regul. 72. [vol. II. p. 492.]

[b] *Εἰ δὲ ταῖς γραφαῖς λέγομεν πιστεύειν, αὗται δὲ ἁπλαῖ καὶ ἀληθεῖς, εὔκολόν σοι τὸ κρινόμενον· εἴ τις ἐκείναις συμφωνεῖ οὗτος Χριστιανός· εἴ τις μάχεται, οὗτος πόρρω τοῦ κανόνος τούτου.* Chrysost. in Act. hom. 33. [vol. IV. p. 799.]

That is the first rule. The second is, that the church ought not to expound one place of scripture that it be repugnant to another; but that in all its interpretations of scripture, upon which all the determinations of controversies depend, the analogy [e] of faith is still to be observed, Rom. xii. 6: which is a rule necessarily also to be observed: for whatsoever is repugnant to any one place of scripture cannot but be false, yea therefore false because repugnant to a place of scripture; and what is false cannot possibly be given as the exposition of any place of scripture therefore because it is false. So that what is repugnant to one cannot be the exposition of another place of scripture, and what is the true exposition of one place of scripture cannot be repugnant to another: for, as St. Paul saith, *All scripture is given by inspiration of God*, 2 Tim. iii. 16: *all scripture*, one place as well as another. And if every place of scripture be from God, it must needs be true; and therefore also whatsoever exposition of one place contradicts another must needs be false. And therefore it cannot be lawful for the church so to expound one place of scripture as to be repugnant to another; for then it would be lawful to pass false expositions upon the scripture, which would be to belie God, saying that he said that which he never did; nay, saying that he hath said that which he hath gainsaid.

---

[c] Debemus ergo ad testimonium verborum, quæ proferimus in doctrina, proferre sensum scripturæ, quasi confirmantem quem exponimus. Origen. in Mat. hom. 25.

[d] Posthæc vero, ut ei moris est, de scripturis sanctis vult affirmare quod dixerat, simul et doctoribus ecclesiæ præbens exemplum, ut ea quæ loquuntur ad populum, non propriis præsumpta sententiis, sed divinis munita testimoniis proferant. Si enim ipse tantus ac talis apostolus auctoritatem dictorum suorum sufficere posse non credidit, nisi doceat in lege et prophetis scripta esse quæ dicit, quanto magis nos minimi hoc observare debemus, ut non nostras cum docemus, sed Spiritus Sancti sententias proferamus? Id. in Rom. iii. [vol. IV. p. 504.]

[e] That the proportion or analogy of faith here spoken of is not to be taken for the quantity of every man's faith in particular, but for the rule of faith in general, Salmero himself acknowledgeth. Non est intelligendum secundum capacitatem et quantitatem fidei ipsius prophetæ, sed secundum generalem rationem fidei, cui annunciandæ et elucidandæ inservit. Salm. in Rom. disp. 2. l. 4. [vol. I. p. 665.]

And therefore we are not to expound one place of scripture so as to make it repugnant to another, but we are to expound one place of scripture by another, the harder by the easier, the darker by the plainer places. [f] "For amongst the things" (saith St. Augustine) "that are clearly contained in scripture are all those things found which contain faith and the manner of living, viz. hope and charity; of which before. But then, a kind of familiarity with the language of the holy scripture being attained, we must seek to open and discuss such things as are obscure; that for the illustrating of darker speeches, examples be taken from the more manifest, and some testimonies of certain sentences take away doubting about uncertain." And again: [g] "But when the proper words do make the scripture doubtful, we must first have a care that we do not distinguish or pronounce wrongly. When therefore diligence being used, it foresees it is uncertain how it should be distinguished or pronounced, let him consult the rule of faith, which he may perceive from the plainer places of the scriptures and the authority of the church." And so Clemens Alexandrinus: [h] "But truth is not found in the changing of significations, for so they overturn all true doctrine; but in the searching out what is most perfectly proper and becoming to the Lord, and the Almighty God, and in confirming whatsoever is demonstrated by the scriptures out of the like scriptures." And therefore we must not expound one place of scripture contrary to another, but one place by another.

---

[f] In iis enim quæ aperte in scriptura posita sunt inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi, spem scilicet atque charitatem, (de quibus libro superiore tractavimus.) Tum vero facta quadam familiaritate cum ipsa lingua divinarum scripturarum, in ea quæ obscura sunt aperienda et discutienda pergendum est; ut ad obscuriores locutiones illustrandas de manifestioribus sumantur exempla, et quædam certarum sententiarum testimonia dubitationem de incertis auferant. Aug. de doctrina Christiana, l. 2. [14. vol. III.]

[g] Sed cum verba propria faciunt ambiguam scripturam, primo providendum est ne male distinxerimus aut pronunciaverimus. Cum ergo

The third rule is, That nothing ought to be enforced as necessary to salvation but what is contained in or may be proved by the scriptures. Which is also a rule necessarily to be observed in the church's executing her authority in the decreeing of rites or ceremonies. Though she may ordain them as necessary to eternal order, yet not as necessary to eternal happiness, unless they be expressly contained in the scriptures, or clearly deduced from them. For the scripture doth bear witness for itself, that itself is able *to make a man wise to salvation,* 2 Tim. iii. 15, which it could not do unless it contained all things necessary to salvation. [i] "But all things," as St. Chrysostome saith, "that are in the holy scriptures are clear and right; all things necessary are manifest." But of this we have spoken more largely in the sixth article, and therefore need not speak any more to it here.

---

adhibita intentio incertum esse providerit quomodo distinguendum aut quomodo pronunciandum sit, consulat regulam fidei, quam de scripturarum planioribus locis, et ecclesiæ autoritate percepit. Ibid. l. 3. [2.]

[h] Ἡ ἀλήθεια δὲ οὐκ ἐν τῷ μετατιθέναι τὰ σημαινόμενα εὑρίσκεται, οὕτω μὲν γὰρ ἀνατρέψουσι πᾶσαν ἀληθῆ διδσσκαλίαν· ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ διασκέψασθαι τί τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τῷ παντοκράτορι Θεῷ τελέως οἰκεῖόν τε καὶ πρέπον· καὶ ἐν τῷ βεβαιοῦν ἕκαστον τῶν ἀποδεικνυμένων κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν πάλιν τῶν ὁμοίων γραφῶν. Clem. Alex. Strom. 7. [16. p. 891.]

[i] Πάντα σαφῆ καὶ εὐθέα τὰ παρὰ ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς· πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα. Chrys. in 2 Thess. hom. 3. [vol. IV. p. 234, 19.]

ARTICLE XXI.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

General councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes.

THE apostles gathering together into a council to decide the question that rose amongst them about the law of Moses, Acts xv. 5, 6, the church hath still thought good in all ages to make use of the same means for the allaying all storms, and determining all controversies that were raised in it, even by gathering itself together into a council to execute that power, which in the foregoing article we have seen the great God hath committed to her. Now if the controversy went no further than a particular church or province, [a] it was long ago determined that the primate or metropolitan of that place should call the bishops and clergy together for the decision of it. But if it spread like a leprosy over the body of the universal church in all or most places, then it was always thought necessary that an universal, œcumenical, or general council, viz. a council gathered together from all or most places of the world where the church of Christ is settled, should put a period to it. And it is these general councils which this article speaks of, determining that they *may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of*

---

[a] *Ὥρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος κατὰ τοὺς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων κανόνας, δὶς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συντρέχειν καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, ἔνθα ἂν ὁ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος δοκιμάσῃ, καὶ διορθοῦν ἕκαστα τὰ ἀνακύπτοντα.* Synod. Chalced. can. 19. [vol. II. p. 610.] *Ἐν πᾶσι τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν θεσπισθέντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς κρατεῖν βουλόμενοι ἀνανεοῦμεν, καὶ τὸν κανόνα τὸν διαγορεύοντα καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος συνόδους τῶν ἐν ἑκάστῃ ἐπαρχίᾳ γίνεσθαι ἐπισκόπων, ἔνθα ἂν ὁ τῆς μητροπόλεως δοκιμάσῃ ἐπίσκοπος.* Concil. Trul. can. 8. [vol. III. p. 1664.] Vid. et concil. Carthag. c. 98. apud Balsam. in can. p. [632. vol. I. Bever. Synod.]

princes. So that it is not lawful for particular churches to meet together in a general council without the consent and command of the particular kings and princes, which the most high God hath been pleased to set over them.

And if we search the scriptures about these things, we may there find it was not to Aaron the high priest, but to Moses their governor, that the Lord said, *Gather to me seventy men of the elders of Israel,* Numbers xi. 16. So that it was Moses that was to call that council which was afterwards [b] termed the great Sanhedrin. And thus we find the several kings, not the high priests, in after-ages gathering of councils together. It was David that called a council to consult about bringing back the ark, 1 Chron. xiii. 1, 2; and afterwards he gathered another council together consisting of all the princes of Israel, with the priests and Levites, ch. xxiii. 2. Thus it was Hezekiah also that gathered the priests and Levites together into a council, 2 Chron. xxix. 4. And it was Solomon that *assembled all the elders of Israel, and the heads of the tribes, and the chief of the fathers of the children of Israel at Jerusalem,* to consult *about bringing up the ark of the covenant of the Lord out of the city of David,* 1 Reg. viii. 1. And it was king Josiah that *sent and gathered to him all the elders of Judah and of Hierusalem* about renewing the covenant of the Lord, 2 Reg. xxiii. 1. And so for that famous, if not most famous and renowned council that ever was gathered together before the coming of Christ, called by the Jews the great synagogue, or the great council[c], which restored the law to its former glory, after it had been long eclipsed in the Babylonian captivity, Ezra could not gather it together until he had first received letters patents from king Artaxerxes for it, Ezra vii. And after Christ was born, we find Herod gathering the chief priests and scribes together into a council, to consult *where Christ should be born*, Matt. ii. 4. Now if the Jews, who had a chief priest appointed by God himself, yet could not call a council without commission from their kings that God had set over them, how much more are Christians, who have no such visible high priest, bound never to meet in such general councils without the command and will of their princes!

---

[b] Amongst the Jews there were two Sanhedrims, סנהדרין גדולה, *synedrium magnum,* which sat at Hierusalem only, Middoth, c. 5, and this is that here spoken of consisting of seventy-one persons in all, though here called by the even number seventy. The other was סנהדרין קטנה, *synedrium minus,* which sat in every city and town of note, consisting of twenty-three judges, which decided the controversies of the place where they sat. So that the great sanhedrim was as it were a general, the lesser a provincial or particular council. The great council is often spoken of in the Chaldee paraphrase, as בירא דחפרו יתה רברבי עלמא מן שירויא אברהם ויצחק ויעקוב שכלילו יתה סוכלתני עלמא סנהדרין שובעתי חכימיא דמפשרון, i. e. *the pit that the princes of the world, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, digged from the beginning, the wise men of the world, the sanhedrim, being seventy wise men and interpreters, perfected it.* Num. xxi. 18. T. H. And because it was gathered together by Moses, it is called the sanhedrim of Moses, לשבחא על יתבי סנהדרין דמשה, *For praise to those that sit in the sanhedrim of Moses.* Targ. in Psal. xlv. tit.

And indeed I cannot see in reason how general councils should be gathered together without the command of princes, seeing princes only have the command over all those who are to be gathered together in those councils. [d] "The emperor," saith Tertullian, "is greater than all, and less than none but the true God." And if he be over all, all must be under him; and if all be under him, certainly none can meet in any public place about any public business (as the works of general councils is) without his command and will.

But it is the practice of the primitive church that may seem to be of the greatest force and consequence in this truth; and therefore I shall insist only upon that. Now Socrates tells us, [e] "And we often," saith he, "mention the kings or emperors in the history, because that from the time that Christianity began to be professed by them, the business of the church depended upon them, and the great councils both were and still are gathered together by their command or sentence." Hence is that of St. Hierome: [f] "Answer, I desire thee; The council by which he was excommunicated, in what city was it? Tell the names of the bishops, produce the sentences of the subscriptions, or their diversity or consonancy. Teach us, who were consuls that year, what emperor commanded this council to be gathered together?" Not what pope, but what emperor. So that it was the emperors that still commanded the councils to be gathered together. And if we consult ecclesiastical histories, we shall find that there was never an ancient general council but what was gathered together by the command and will of emperors. Let these following, which were the principal if not only general councils that ever were, suffice for the rest.

---

[c] Thus it is said in the Hierusalem Talmud, כיון שעמדו אנשי כנסת הגדולה החזירו את הגדולה ליושנה, *when the men of the great council stood up, they restored the magnificence (of the law) to its ancient state.* Megil. c. 3. fi. [עד v.] And elsewhere, ובית דינו של עזרא הרא הנקרא כנסת חגדולה שהחזירו העטרה ליושנה, i. e. *And Ezra's house of judgment is that which is called the great council or synagogue, which restored the crown (of the law) to its ancient state.* Iuchas. fol. 13. And again, ונקראו כן לפי שנתקבצו לתקן תקנות ראויות להישיר את העם ולהחזיר את בדק התורה, *And they were called so (viz. the men of the great synagogue) because they were gathered together to confirm constitutions tending to the directing of the people, and to the restoring or making up the breach of the law.* Abarbin. præf. ad l. נחלות אבות. [p. 5.] V. et Joma, fol. 69. 2. See more of this council in the beginning of the sixth article.

[d] Imperator omnibus major, solo vero Deo minor. Tertul. ad Scap. [c. 2. vol. III.]

[e] *Συνεχῶς καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῇ ἱστορίᾳ περιλαμβάνομεν, διότι ἀφ᾽ οὗ χριστιανίζειν ἤρξαντο τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πράγματα ἤρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν, καὶ αἱ μέγισται σύνοδοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ γεγόνασί τε καὶ γίνονται.* Socrat. hist. l. 5. procem. v. Jus G. R. 317.

The first general council ever since our Saviour's time was the Nicene. Now it is plain, that that was gathered together by the command and will of Constantine the Great; so Eusebius, an eyewitness, saith in the life of the said emperor: [g] "He," Constantine, "after this mustering the army of God to himself, gathered together an œcumenical or general council, commanding the bishops from all places by his honourable letters to haste together." And so Socrates: [h] "The emperor therefore seeing the church troubled about these two things, he gathered together a general council, calling the bishops from all places by his letters to meet at Nice, a city of Bithynia." And Nicetas: [i] "The emperor, by his public letters, commanded that all bishops should come together at Nice, the chief city of Bithynia." And if these particular persons' words will not be taken for this truth, we have the whole council itself attesting: for writing a letter to the church of Alexandria, they begin it thus: [k]"Seeing that by the grace of God and the command of the most holy emperor, that gathered us together from several cities and provinces, this great and holy council is met at Nice," &c. So then it is clear the first general council was gathered together by the emperor, and that Constantine.

---

[f] Responde quæso, synodus a qua excommunicatus est, in qua urbe fuit? Dic episcoporum vocabula, profer sententias subscriptionum, vel diversitatem vel consonantiam. Doce qui eo anno consules fuerint, quis imperator hanc synodum jusserit congregari? Hieron. Apol. 2. [19. vol. II.] adv. Ruffin. V. Allat. de consens. 218, 219, &c.

[g] *Εἶθ' ὥσπερ ἐπιστρατεύων αὐτῷ Θεοῦ φάλαγγα, σύνοδον οἰκουμενικὴν συνεκρότει, σπεύδειν ἁπανταχόθεν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους γράμμασι τιμητικοῖς προκαλούμενος.* Euseb. de vita Constant. l. 3. c. 6.

[h] *Δι' ἀμφότερα τοίνυν ὁρῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς ταραττομένην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, σύνοδον οἰκουμενικὴν συνεκρότει, τοὺς πανταχόθεν ἐπισκόπους διὰ γραμμάτων εἰς Νίκαιαν τῆς Βιθυνίας ἀπαντῆσαι παρακαλῶν.* Socrat. Hist. l. 1. c. [8.]

[i] Publico programmate imperator

The second general council met at Constantinople, and that by the command of an emperor too, even Theodosius: for so saith Socrates, speaking of the said emperor; [l]"But the emperor without delay called together a council of bishops of his faith, to confirm the faith established at Nice, and to ordain a bishop for Constantinople." And Sozomen to the same purpose: [m]"And presently the emperor called together a council of bishops of the same judgment with himself, for the confirmation of the Nicene decrees, and for the ordination of one who should be bishop of Constantinople, or oversee the throne of Constantinople, hoping also that those which were called Macedonians might be joined to the catholic church."

The third general council was the Ephesine, and that was gathered together by Theodosius the younger. So Evagrius: [n]"He likewise desired," saith he, "that by the command of Theodosius the younger, who then governed the East, the

---

edixit, ut omnes episcopi Nicæam Bithyniæ metropolim convenirent. Nicet. Thes. l. 5. c. 5.

[k] Ἐπειδὴ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος καὶ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου συναγαγόντος ἡμᾶς ἐκ διαφόρων πόλεών τε καὶ ἐπαρχιῶν, μεγάλη καὶ ἁγία σύνοδος ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνεκροτήθη. Socrat. Hist. l. 1. c. [9.]

[l] Μηδὲν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑπερθέμενος σύνοδον ἐπισκόπων τῆς αὐτοῦ πίστεως συγκαλεῖ, ἐπὶ τὸ κρατῦναι τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν, καὶ χειροτονῆσαι τῇ Κωνσταντίνου πόλει ἐπίσκοπον. Socrat. Hist. l. 5. c. 8.

[m] Ἐν τάχει τε καὶ σύνοδον ἐπισκόπων ὁμοδόξων αὐτῷ συνεκάλεσε, βεβαιότητός τε ἕνεκεν τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ δοξάντων, καὶ χειροτονίας τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐπισκοπεῖν τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, ὑπολαβών τε δύνασθαι συνάψαι τῇ καθόλου ἐκκλησίᾳ τοὺς καλουμένους Μακεδονιανούς. Sozom. Hist. l. 7. c. 7.

[n] Εἰκότως ἐδέησε νεύμασι τοῦ νέου Θεοδοσίου τὰ σκῆπτρα τῆς ἑώας διέποντος, τὴν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρώτην σύνοδον ἀλισθῆναι· γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν γενομένων πρός τε Κύριλλον καὶ τοὺς ἁπανταχῆ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν προεστηκότας, ἃ κυρίαν συνελεύσεως ἀπέφηνε τὴν ἁγίαν πεντηκοστὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν ᾗ τὸ ζωοποιὸν ἡμῖν ἐπεφοίτησε πνεῦμα. Evagr. Hist. l. 1. c. 3.

first council might be gathered together at Ephesus. The king's letters therefore were sent to Cyril, and the rulers of the holy church every where, which appointed the day of the holy Pentecost, in which the Spirit of life came down to us, to be the day of their meeting together." Thus much doth the council itself also acknowledge, saying to the emperors, [o] "The holy council, which was gathered together by the grace of God and the authority of your dominion, in the chief city of the Ephesians."

The fourth general council was gathered together at Chalcedon, and that by Marcianus, Theodosius's successor. So Leontius: [p] "Theodosius being dead, Marcianus was made emperor, and presently commands a general council to meet at Chalcedon." And in the Acts of the synod itself it is said, [q] "In Chalcedon, the chief city of the province of Bithynia, there was gathered together a council by the decree of the emperors Valentinianus and Marcianus."

The fifth general council was at Constantinople again, gathered together by the emperor Justinianus. So Evagrius: [r] "And Eustochius," saith he, "being bishop of Hierusalem, Justinian gathered together the fifth council." And so Nicephorus: [s] "The emperor Justinian gathered together the fifth holy general council, the bishops of all churches being called together."

The sixth general council is that which is commonly called the Trullan council, gathered together by Justinian, the son of Constantinus Pogonatus. So Balsamon: [t] "The second

---

[o] Ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἡ χάριτι Θεοῦ καὶ νεύματι τοῦ ὑμετέρου κράτους συναχθεῖσα ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσιῶν μητροπόλει. Concil. Ephes. ad imperat. [vol. I. p. 1440.]

[p] Ἀποθανόντος Θεοδοσίου γίνεται βασιλεὺς Μαρκιανὸς, καὶ ἐπιτρέπει εὐθέως γενέσθαι οἰκουμενικὴν σύνοδον ἐν Χαλκηδόνι. Leont. [de sectis, p. 462.]

[q] In civitate Chalcedonensi, metropoli provinciæ Bithyniæ, facta est synodus ex decreto imperatorum Valentiniani et Marciani. Act. concil. Chalced. [vol. II. p. 54.] V. et relat. hujus synodi ad Leon. Romæ episcopum. [Ibid. p. 655.]

[r] Ἱεροσολύμων τε Εὐστοχίου, τὴν πεμπτὴν μεταπέμπεται σύνοδον Ἰουστινιανός. Evag. Hist. l. 4. c. 57.

[s] Imperator Justinianus sanctam quintam œcumenicam synodum episcopis ecclesiarum omnium convocatis coegit. Niceph. Hist. l. 17. c. 27.

[t] Τοῦ δευτέρου Ἰουστινιανοῦ, τοῦ Ῥινοτμήτου δηλαδὴ βασιλεύοντος, ὃς ἦν υἱὸς τοῦ Πωγωνάτου Κωνσταντίνου, συνῆλθον ἐπίσκοποι διακόσιοι εἴκοσι καὶ ἑπτὰ κατὰ κέλευσιν τοῦ ῥηθέντος αὐτοκράτορος, καὶ κανόνας ἐξέθεντο εἰς κατάστασιν ἐκκλησιαστι-

Justinian, viz. he that was called Rinotmetus, being emperor, who was the son of Pogonatus Constantinus, 227 bishops met together by the command of the said emperor, and put forth canons for ecclesiastical constitutions." And the council itself, writing to the said emperor, begins thus: [u] "To the most holy and Christ-loving emperor Justinian, the holy and general council, by the divine will and decree of your most holy power, met together in this divinely preserved and royal city." And afterwards; [x] "Wherefore meeting together by the command of your holiness in this divinely preserved and royal city, we have written these holy canons."

The seventh general council was the second Nicene council, which was gathered together by the emperors Constantinus and Irene. In the beginning whereof we read, [y] "The holy and general council meeting, which by the grace of God and the holy decree of these emperors piously governing the world, is gathered together in the most famous city and metropolis of Nice." And the letters of the emperors to the council still run thus: [z] "Constantinus and Irene, the faithful emperors of the Romans, to the holy bishops met together by the will of God, and our grace, and the command of our holy empire, in the Nicene council."

The eighth general council was gathered together at Constantinople by the emperor Basil; for so we read in the prologue to the acts of that council; [a] "By the will of God

---

κήν. Balsam. de ea synodo quæ dicitur sexta, [apud Beverigii Synodic. I. p. 151.]

[u] *Τῷ εὐσεβεστάτῳ καὶ φιλοχρίστῳ βασιλεῖ Ἰουστινιανῷ ἡ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος ἡ κατὰ θεῖον νεῦμα καὶ θέσπισμα τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ὑμῶν κράτους συναθροισθεῖσα κατὰ ταυτὴν τὴν θεοφύλακτον καὶ βασιλίδα πόλιν.* Concil. Trul. ad imper. Justin. [Conc. vol. III. p. 1652.] V. Balsam. in canones, [apud Bev. I. p. 153.]

[x] *Ἐπὶ τοῦτο τοίνυν κατὰ κέλευσιν τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας συνελθόντες, κατὰ ταύτην τὴν θεοφύλακτον καὶ βασιλίδα πόλιν, κανόνας ἱεροὺς ἀνεγράψαμεν.* Ibid. [Conc. ibid. p. 1656.]

[y] Conveniente sancta et œcumenica synodo, quæ per gratiam divinam, piumque illorum imperatorum sancte orbem terrarum gubernantium decretum, congregata est in clarissima Nicensium metropoli. Conc. Nicen. sec. init. [Conc. coll. reg. Par. 1644. vol. XVIII. p. 245.]

[z] Constantinus et Irene fideles Romanorum imperatores, divina voluntate et nostra gratia jussuque sacrati nostri imperii congregatis sanctissimis episcopis in Nicæna synodo. Liter. imper. ad concil. Nicen. sec. [Ibid. p. 251.]

[a] *Διακονησαμένου καὶ καθυπουργήσαντος τῇ θείᾳ βουλῇ, καὶ ψήφῳ τοῦ φιλοχρίστου καὶ θεοκυβερνήτου μεγάλου βασιλέως ἡμῶν Βασιλείου· οὗτος*

administering and assisting, and by the decree of our Christ-loving and divinely governing great emperor Basil: for he gathering together the general council did piously fulfil such things as seemed good to the Holy Ghost."

And thus we see how the eight first, if not all the general councils that were ever gathered together, were still gathered together by the princes or emperors. And truly these eight are all the councils the Grecians, or any one else but the papists, will acknowledge to be general councils. So that all that were ever truly general councils were still gathered together by the command and will of princes. Whence we may well conclude, without their command and will no such general councils may be gathered together.

And when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining to God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of the holy Scripture.

To demonstrate the truth of this latter part of the article, I need prove no more than that general councils have so erred: for if they have erred, it must needs follow that they may err; and if they may err and have erred, it must needs follow also, that what they *ordain as necessary to salvation can have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be proved that it is taken out of the holy scripture.* For they may ordain that which the scripture doth not say is necessary to salvation, nay, that which the scripture saith is not necessary to salvation; whereas we have seen, art. VI, that all things necessary to salvation are contained in the scriptures. And therefore

---

γὰρ οἰκουμενικὴν σύνοδον συναθροίσας, τὰ δόξαντα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεῦματι θεοσεβῶς ἀπεπλήρωσεν. Concil. Constant. quart. in procem. act. [Concil. Hard. vol. V. p. 1025.]

what is not contained in the scriptures, nor may be proved from them, though all the councils in the world should ordain it as necessary to salvation, their ordaining it as necessary to salvation cannot make it so.

But now to prove that general councils have erred, I shall use the same argument whereby I proved that the church of Rome hath erred, art. XIX, even because they have decreed some things contrary to the doctrine of these Articles, all of which, being grounded upon scripture, consonant to reason, and delivered by the Fathers, cannot but be true; and by consequence, whatsoever is contrary to them cannot but be false.

Now the first general council I think that ever decreed any thing contrary to these Articles, or so erred in matters of faith, was the second Nicene council, which, as Balsamon [b] saith, relatively defined that images should be worshipped and saluted: and therefore they decreed also, "That [c] all the childish scoffings, and mad words, and all lying writings whatsoever made against venerable images ought to be given into the bishopric of Constantinople, that they may be put amongst other heretical books.

And several other the like decrees about images did this council make, wherein, as we shall see in the next article, the catholic church cannot but acknowledge they erred.

The other councils that pretended to be general, and erred in contradicting any truths contained in these Articles, are of a far later date; as the Lateran council, which determined, [d] "That the true body and blood of Christ are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated, or substantially changed into the body, and the wine into the blood of Christ by the power of God:" and the council of Constance, that decreed, [e] "That no presbyter administer both the kinds, viz. both bread and wine, to the people under the pain of excommunication," contrary to art. XXX. In the same [f] error also was the council of Basil: which also declared, [g] "That the doctrine that asserts the blessed Virgin Mary, by the singular preventing and working grace of God, did not actually lie under original sin, but was always free from both original and actual fault, holy and unspotted, is to be approved, held, and embraced as holy doctrine, and consonant to ecclesiastical worship, the catholic faith, right reason, and the holy scripture," contrary to art. IX. and the XVth.

---

[b] *Ἥτις τὰς εἰκονομικὰς ἐκτυπώσεις προσκυνεῖσθαι καὶ κατασπάζεσθαι σχετικῶς ἐψηφίσατο.* Balsam. proœm. ad can. 7. synodi, [ap. Bev. ibid. p. 284.]

[c] *Πάντα τὰ μειρακιώδη ἀθύρματα, καὶ μανιώδη βακχεύματα, τὰ ψευδοσυγγράμματα, τὰ κατὰ τῶν σεπτῶν εἰκόνων γινόμενα, δέον δοθῆναι ἐν τῷ ἐπισκοπείῳ Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως· ἵνα ἀποτεθῶσιν μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν αἱρετικῶν βιβλίων.* Concil. Nicen. sec. can. 9. [vol. IV. p. 492.]

[d] Verum Christi corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem potestate divina. Concil. Lateran. quart. can. 1. [Conc. vol. II.]

The council of Florence declares, [h] "That if any being truly penitents depart in the love of God before they have satisfied for their commissions and omissions by the worthy fruits of repentance, their souls are purged in the pains of purgatory," contrary to art. XXII. They declared also, [i] "That the sacraments of the New Testament are seven, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony; and that [k] by virtue of the sacramental words the substance of the bread is changed into the body of Christ, and the substance of the wine into the blood: yet so as that Christ is wholly contained under the form of bread, and wholly under the form of wine; yea, and under every part of the consecrated host and consecrated wine, after separation, the whole Christ is contained;" both contrary to art. XXIV.

---

[e] Item præcipimus sub pœna excommunicationis, quod nullus presbyter communicet populum sub utraque specie panis et vini. Concil. Constant. sess. 13. [vol. VIII.]

[f] Hæc sancta synodus decernit et declarat, quod fideles laici communicantes et non conficientes non astringuntur ex præcepto Domini, ad suscipiendum sub utraque specie, panis scilicet et vini, sacrum eucharistiæ sacramentum. Concil. Basil. sess. 30. [Ibid.]

[g] Doctrinam illam disserentem, gloriosam virginem Mariam, præveniente et operante divini Numinis gratia singulari, nunquam actualiter subjacuisse originali peccato, sed immunem semper fuisse ab omni originali et actuali culpa, sanctamque et immaculatam, tanquam piam et consonam cultui ecclesiastico, fidei catholicæ, rectæ rationi, et sacræ scripturæ approbandam fore et tenendam et amplectendam definimus et declaramus. Ses. 36. [Ibid.]

[h] Item, si vere pœnitentes in Dei charitate decesserint, antequam dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus de commissis satisfecerint et omissis, eorum animas pœnis purgatorii purgari. Concil. Florent. de purg. [vol. IX. p. 957.]

[i] Novæ legis septem sunt sacramenta, scilicet baptismus, confirmatio, eucharistia, pœnitentia, extrema unctio, ordo et matrimonium. Ibid. [p. 437.] et in concil. Lateran. 5.

[k] Nam ipsorum verborum virtute substantia panis in corpus Christi, substantia vini in sanguinem convertuntur; ita tamen quod totus Christus continetur sub specie panis, et totus sub specie vini; sub qualibet quoque parte hostiæ consecratæ et vini consecrati, separatione facta, totus est Christus. Ibid. [p. 439.]

But it would be an endless thing to reckon up the many errors of the papistical, falsely called general and œcumenical councils. Some of the many errors of the Tridentine council I have written down, art. XIX. Many more, both of that and other councils, I might record here: but these already rehearsed are both great and many enough, from whence to conclude, that general councils may, yea, and have erred.

ARTICLE XXII.

OF PURGATORY.

The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

IN this article we have several of the Romish inventions crowded up together. I shall single them out one after another, that so, though I speak but briefly, I may speak clearly to them all.

And first therefore to encounter with that which stands in the forefront of the battle, and that is Purgatory; of which it is here said, that *the Romish doctrine concerning it is a fond thing*, *repugnant to the Word.* Now to handle this aright, there are two things to be done; first, to shew what is the Romish doctrine concerning it; and secondly, to shew what a fond and false thing it is. As for the first, what the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory is, I think it cannot be better explained than by the Romish doctors themselves, who tell us in the council of Trent, [a] "If any one say, that after the grace of justification received, the fault is so pardoned to every penitent sinner, and the guilt of eternal punishment is so blotted out, that there remains no guilt of temporal punishment to be done away in this world, or that which is to come in purgatory, before the passage can be opened into heaven, let him be accursed." And elsewhere they say, [b] "There is a purgatory, and that the souls detained there are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the sacrifices of the acceptable altar." So that, as Bellarmine saith, [c] "Purgatory is a certain place, in which, as in a prison, the souls are purged after this life, which were not fully purged in this life, to wit, that so they may be able to enter into heaven, where no unclean thing enters in."

---

[a] Si quis post acceptam justificationis gratiam, cuilibet peccatori pœnitenti ita culpam remitti, et reatum æternæ pœnæ deleri dixerit, ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exolvendæ vel in hoc sæculo, vel in futuro in purgatorio, antequam ad regnum cœlorum aditus patere possit, anathema sit. Concil. Trident. sess. 6. c. 30. [vol. X. p. 43.]

Thus we see in few words what the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory is. Now that this doctrine is a fond thing is plain, in that by [d] the confession of some of their own writers there is little or no footing for it in the scriptures; nay, if we examine it by scripture light, we shall find it so far from being grounded upon scripture, that it is directly contrary to it; for the scriptures say, *The dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun*, Eccles. ix. 5, 6: whereas this doctrine saith quite contrary, that when they are dead they have a part or portion in the prayers of the faithful and the sacrifices of the altar. Again, the scripture makes mention but of a twofold receptacle of souls after death, the one of happiness, the other of misery, 1 Sam. xxv. 29. Matt. vii. 13, 14. viii. 11. Luke xvi. 22, 23: whereas this doctrine brings in a third, called Purgatory, betwixt heaven and hell, half happiness and half misery. Again, the scripture saith, *The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth*, or purgeth *us from all sin*, 1 John i. 7; but this doctrine would persuade us, there are some sins which are to be purged away by the prayers and good works of others. To name no more, the scripture saith, *He that believeth shall not come into condemnation, but pass from death to life*, John v. 24; and therefore St. Paul saith, [e] *I am in a strait between two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ*, Phil. i. 23. So that St. Paul reckoned verily upon it, that so soon as ever he was dead he should be with Christ, no sooner *absent from the body* but *present with the Lord*, 2 Cor. v. 8. Whereas this Romish doctrine about purgatory bids him not to be so hasty, for he might depart and yet not be with Christ neither; he might pass from death, and yet not to life; he might and must be absent from the body a good while before he be present with the Lord; he might go from earth yet not to heaven, but to purgatory, a place St. Paul never dreamed of. So that this doctrine directly contradicts the scripture. The scriptures say, *we shall pass from death to life;* this doctrine saith we shall not pass from death to life, but to purgatory: the scripture, that when we are *absent from the body we are present with the Lord;* but this doctrine, when we are absent from the body we are not present with the Lord: the scripture; that *when we depart we shall be with Christ;* this doctrine, that when we depart we shall be in purgatory: the scriptures, that we must go directly from earth to heaven; but this doctrine, that we must go about by purgatory, first going from life to death, then from death to purgatory, and from purgatory to heaven.

---

[b] Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabilis altaris sacrificio juvari. Ibid. sess. 25. init. [Ibid. p. 167.]

[c] Purgatorium est locus quidam, in quo tanquam in carcere post hanc vitam purgantur animæ, quæ in hac vita non fuerunt plene purgatæ, ut nimirum sic in cœlum ingredi valeant, quo nihil intrabit coinquinatum. Bellar. de purgat. l. I. c. I. [vol. II. p. 699.]

[d] Quanquam fortassis unam aliquam scripturam, quæ protervientem adigat, ut velit nolit confiteatur purgatorium, in promptu non sit adducere; potest esse nihilominus illic aliqua, tametsi diligentissimos inquisitores hactenus illa latuerit. Roffen. contra Luth. art. 37. [Fischer. p. 718.] Minus apertas, minus efficaces esse, et minus probare autoritates scripturæ quæ a doctoribus afferuntur, illis itaque non esse utendum ad probandum purgatorium. Petrus a Soto de instruct. sacerd. lect. I. [p. 205.]

And as this doctrine herein doth contradict the scriptures, so doth it contradict the Fathers too. For Origen saith, [f] "We, after the labours and strivings of this present life, hope to be in the highest heavens," not in purgatory. And so St. Chrysostome; [g] "For those that truly follow virtue, after they are changed from this life they be truly freed from their fightings, and loosed from their bonds: for death to such as live honestly is a change from worse to better, from this transitory to an immortal and eternal life that hath no end." And Macarius, speaking of the faithful, [h] "When," saith he, "they go out of their bodies, the quires of angels receive their souls into their proper places, to the pure world, and so lead them to the Lord." Whence Athanasius saith, [i] "To the righteous it is not death, but only a change; for they are changed from this world to an eternal rest. And as a man would come out of prison, so do the saints go from this troublesome life to the good things prepared for them." Certainly these Fathers were no Purgatorians, who so unanimously affirmed the souls of the saints to go directly from earth to heaven, never touching upon purgatory.

---

[e] Christum lædimus cum evocatos quosque ab illo quasi miserandos non æquanimiter accipimus. *Cupio*, inquit apostolus, *recipi et esse cum Christo.* Quanto melius ostendit votum Christianorum? Ergo votum, si alios consecutos impatienter dolemus, ipsi consequi nolumus. Tertull. de patientia, c. 9. [vol. IV. p. 79.]

[f] *Διὰ τοῦτο ἡμεῖς μετὰ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα πόνους καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐλπίζομεν πρὸς ἄκροις γενέσθαι τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.* Origen. contra Cels. l. 6. [20. vol. I.]

To these we may add Gennadius, who assures us, [k] "That after the ascension of the Lord to heaven, the souls of all the saints are with Christ, and going out of the body go to Christ, expecting the resurrection of their body." And to name no more in so plain a case, Prosper also tells us, [l] "According to the language of the holy scriptures, the whole life of man upon earth is a temptation or trial. Then is the temptation to be avoided when the fight is ended; and then is the fight to be ended, when after this life secure victory succeeds the fight, that all the soldiers of Christ, who, being helped by God, have to the end of this present life unweariedly resisted their enemies, their wearisome travail being ended, they may reign happily in their country." So that they do not go from one fight here to another in purgatory, but immediately from the church militant on earth to the church triumphant in heaven. From whence we may well conclude, that *the Romish doctrine about purgatory is a fond thing, repugnant to scripture*, yea, and Fathers too. And therefore I pass from the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory to that

---

[g] *Οἱ γὰρ μετὰ ἀκριβείας τὴν ἀρετὴν μετιόντες, ἐπειδὰν τῆς ἐντεῦθεν ζωῆς μεταστῶσιν, ἀληθῶς ὥσπερ ἀπολύονται τῶν ἀγώνων, καὶ τῶν δεσμῶν ἀνίενται· καὶ γὰρ μετάστασις τίς ἐστι τοῖς ἐναρέτως βιοῦσιν, ἀπὸ τῶν χειρόνων ἐπὶ τὰ βελτίω, ἀπὸ τῆς προσκαίρου ζωῆς ἐπὶ τὴν διηνεκῆ καὶ ἀθάνατον καὶ πέρας οὐκ ἔχουσαν.* Chrysost. in Gen. hom. 36. [vol. I. p. 295.]

[h] *Ὅταν ἐξέλθωσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος, οἱ χοροὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς εἰς τὸ ἀΐδιον μέρος, εἰς τὸν καθαρὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ οὕτως αὐτοὺς προσάγουσι τῷ Κυρίῳ.* Macar. Ægyp. hom. 22.

[i] *Οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ παρὰ τοῖς δικαίοις θάνατος, ἀλλὰ μετάθεσις· μετατίθενται γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον ἀνάπαυσιν· καὶ ὥσπερ τις ἀπὸ φυλακῆς ἐξέλθοι, οὕτως καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι ἐξέρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ μοχθηροῦ βίου τούτου εἰς τὰ ἀγαθὰ τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα αὐτοῖς.* Athanas. de virgin. [18. vol. II. p. 120.]

[k] Post ascensionem Domini ad cœlos, omnium sanctorum animæ cum Christo sunt, et exeuntes de corpore ad Christum vadunt, expectantes resurrectionem corporis sui. Gennad. de eccles. dogmat. c. 79.

[l] Quia secundum scripturæ sacræ sermonem, tota humana vita tentatio est super terram, tunc est tentatio fugienda, quando finitur et pugna: et tunc est finienda pugna, quando post hanc vitam succedit pugnæ secura victoria, ut omnes milites Christi, qui usque in finem vitæ præsentis divinitus adjuti, suis hostibus indefatigabiliter restiterint, laboriosa jam peregrinatione transacta, regnent felices in patria. Prosp. de vita contempl. l. 1. c. 1.

Concerning Pardons.

And here (and also in the rest of the Romish doctrines spoken of in this article) I shall follow the same method as I did in Purgatory, even to shew, first, what their doctrine is, and then, how repugnant to the scriptures. As for the first, what their doctrine concerning pardons is, it is difficult to determine; they have had so many crotchets about it, that one can scarce tell where to find them. I shall endeavour to explain it in these following propositions:

First, they assert, as [m] Bellarmine saith, "That many holy men have suffered more for God and righteousness' sake than the guilt of the temporal punishment, which they were obnoxious to for faults committed by them, could exact."

Secondly, hence they say, as Johannes de Turrecremata, [n] "That one can satisfy for another, or one can acceptably perform satisfactory punishments for another," viz. because they suffer more than is due to their own sins; and seeing all sufferings are satisfactory, what they undergo more than is due to their own, is satisfactory for other men's sins.

---

[m] Asserimus non paucos sanctos homines multo plura propter Deum et justitiam esse perpessos, quam exigeret reatus pœnæ temporalis, cui fuerunt obnoxii propter culpas ab ipsis commissas. Bellarm. de indulg. [vol. III. p. 1498.]

[n] Unus pro alio satisfacere potest, sive unus pœnam satisfactoriam pro alio potest explere Deo acceptabiliter. Johan. de Turrec. art. 2. concl. 1.

Thirdly, [o] "Seeing they who thus undergo satisfactory punishments for others do not appoint the fruit of this their satisfaction to any particular persons, it therefore," as Roffensis saith, "becomes profitable to the whole church in common, so that it is now called the common treasury of the church, to wit, that from thence may be fetched whatsoever any one lacks of due satisfaction."

Fourthly, [p] "This common treasure," saith Bellarmine, "is the foundation of pardons." So that, as he saith, [q] "The church hath power to apply this treasure of satisfaction, and by this to grant out pardons."

By this therefore we may have some sight into this great mystery, and perceive what they mean by pardons. For, as Lamannus the Jesuit saith, [r] "A pardon or indulgence is the remission of a temporal punishment due to God without the sacrament, by the application of the satisfaction of Christ and the saints." Or as Gregorius de Valentia saith, [s] "An ecclesiastical pardon or indulgence is a relaxation of a temporal punishment by God's judgment due to actual sins, after the remission of the fault made without the sacrament (of penance) by the application of the superabundant satisfactions of Christ and the saints by him who hath lawful authority to do it." But let us hear what a pope himself saith concerning these pardons. Leo the Xth in his Decretal, ann. 1518, saith, [t] "The pope of Rome may for reasonable causes grant to the same saints of Christ, who, charity uniting them, are members of Christ, whether they be in this life or in purgatory, pardons out of the superabundancy of the merits of Christ and the saints: and that he used, for the living as well as for the dead, by his apostolical power of granting pardons, to dispense or distribute the treasures of the merits of Christ and the saints, to confer the indulgence itself after the manner of an absolution, or transfer it after the manner of a suffrage." So that, as Durandus saith, [u] "The church can communicate from this treasure to any one, or several persons, for their sins in part or in whole, according as it pleaseth the church to communicate more or less from the treasure." And hence it is that we find it said in the books of Indulgences or Pardons, [x] "That Silvester and Gregory, that consecrated the Lateran church, gave so many pardons that none could number them but God, St. Boniface being witness, who said, If men knew the pardons of the Lateran church, they would not need to go by sea to the holy sepulchre. In the chapel of the Saints are twenty-eight stairs, that stood before the house of Pilate in Hierusalem: whosoever shall ascend those stairs with devotion, hath for every sin nine years of pardons; but he that ascends them kneeling, shall free one soul out of purgatory." So that it seems the pope cannot only give me a pardon for sins past, but to come; yea, and not only give me a pardon for my own sins, but power too to pardon other men's sins, else I could not redeem a soul from purgatory.

---

[o] Et quoniam illi suæ satisfactionis fructum nullis destinarunt personis certis, ideo fit ut in commune cesserit ecclesiæ totius emolumentum, et communis ecclesiæ thesaurus jam dicatur, nimirum ut inde rependatur quicquid cæteris ex justa satisfactione defuerit. [Fischer. episc.] Roffens. art. 17. [p. 491.]

[p] Extat thesaurus aliquis in ecclesia qui est fundamentum indulgentiarum. Bellarm. de indulg. l. 1. c. 2. [tit.]

[q] Est in ecclesia potestas applicandi thesaurum satisfactionum, ac per hoc indulgentias concedendi. Ibid. c. 3. [tit.]

[r] Indulgentia est pœnæ temporalis Deo debitæ remissio extra sacramentum, per applicationem satisfactionis Christi et sanctorum. Layman. Theol. mor. l. 5. tract. 7. c. 1. [summarium.]

[s] Indulgentia ecclesiastica est relaxatio pœnæ temporalis judicio divino peccatis actualibus post remissam culpæ debitæ, per applicationem superabundantium Christi et sanctorum satisfactionum facta extra sacramentum, ab eo qui legitimam ad hoc autoritatem habet. Greg. de Valent. de indulg. [init.]

[t] Romanum pontificem, &c. posse pro rationalibus causis concedere eisdem Christi fidelibus qui charitate jungente membra sunt Christi, sive in hac vita sunt, sive in purgatorio, indulgentias ex superabundantia

---

meritorum Christi et sanctorum; ac tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis apostolica autoritate indulgentiam concedendi, thesaurum meritorum Christi et sanctorum dispensare, per modum absolutionis indulgentiam ipsam conferre, vel per modum suffragii illam transferre consuevisse. Leo X. decret. [apud Lutheri Op. vol. I. p. 229.]

[u] Ecclesia de hoc thesauro potest communicare alicui vel aliquibus pro eorum peccatis in parte vel in toto, secundum quod placet ecclesiæ, de hoc thesauro plus aut minus communicare. Durand. de indulg.

[x] Papa Silvester et Gregorius, qui ecclesiam Lateranensem consecrarent, dederint tantas indulgentias ut nemo eas possit numerare quam solus Deus: testante Bonifacio, qui dixit: Si homines scirent indulgentias ecclesiæ Lateranensis non opus esset ut irent per mare ad s. sepulchrum. In capella sanctorum sunt 28 gradus qui steterunt ante ædes Pilati in Jerusalem. Quicunque hos gradus ascenderit cum devotione habet pro quolibet peccato novem annos indulgentiarum; qui vero geniculando gradus illos ascendit, is unam animam liberat a purgatorio. Lib. indulg. [Vid. Fiscus papalis; transl. by Crashaw, chap. I.]

I have been the larger in opening this great Romish mystery, because I need do no more than open it: for it being thus opened, shews itself to be a ridiculous and impious doctrine, utterly repugnant to the scriptures: for this doctrine thus explained is grounded upon works of supererogation; for it is from the treasury of these good works that the Romish church fetcheth all her pardons. Now this is but a bad foundation, contrary to scripture, reason, and Fathers, as we have seen art. XIV: and if the foundation be rotten, the superstructure cannot be sound. Again, this doctrine supposes one man may and doth satisfy for another; whereas the scripture holds forth Christ as *our only propitiation*, 1 Joh. ii. 2, *who trod the winepress of his Father's wrath alone*, Isa. lxiii. 3. Lastly, This doctrine supposes that a pope, a priest, a finite creature, can pardon sins; whereas the scripture holds forth this as the prerogative only of the true God: for *who is a God like unto thee*, saith the Prophet Micah, *that pardoneth iniquities?* Mic. vii. 18. And therefore the scribes and Pharisees, when they said, *Who can forgive sins but God alone?* Luke v. 21, what they said, though wickedly said by them, not acknowledging Christ to be God, and so not to have that power, yet it was truly said in itself: for had not Christ been God, he would have had no more power to forgive sins than the pope.

And whatsoever the doctors of the Romish church now hold, I am sure the Fathers of old constantly affirmed that it was God only could forgive sins. So St. Chrysostome saith; [y] "For none can pardon sins but only God." Euthymius, [z] "None can truly pardon sins but he alone who beholds the thoughts of men." St. Gregory, [a] "Thou who alone sparest, who alone forgivest sins: for who can forgive sins but God alone?" St. Ambrose, [b] "For this cannot be common to any

[y] *Οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Θεός.* Chrysost. in 2 Cor. hom. 6. [vol. III. p. 581. 34.]

[z] Vere nullus potest remittere peccata, nisi unus qui intuetur cogitationes hominum. Euthym. in Mat. c. 13. V. et Druthmar. et Radbert. et Walafr. Strab. in eundem locum.

[a] Tu qui solus parcis, qui solus peccata dimittis: quis enim potest dimittere peccata nisi solus Deus? Greg. in Psal. 32. 6. seu sec. pœnitent.

[b] Solus remanet, quia non potest

man with Christ to forgive sins. This is his gift only who took away the sins of the world." Certainly the Fathers never thought of the pope's pardons, when they let such and the like sentences slip from them. Nay, and Athanasius was so confident that it was God only could pardon sin, that he brings this as an argument against the Arians, to prove that Christ was God, because he could pardon sin. [c] "But how," saith he, "if the Word was a creature, could he loose the sentence of God, and pardon sin? It being written by the prophets, that this belongs to God; for *who is a God like to thee; pardoning sins, and passing by transgressions?* For God said, *Thou art earth, and unto earth thou shalt return.* So that men are mortal: and how then was it possible that sin should be pardoned or loosed by creatures? Yet Christ loosed and pardoned them." Certainly, had the pope's pardons been heard of in that age, this would have been but a weak argument. For Arius might easily have answered, It doth not follow, that because Christ could pardon sin he was therefore God; for the pope is not God, and yet he can pardon sin. But thus we see the Fathers confidently averring, it is God only can pardon sins, and therefore that the pope cannot pardon them by any means whatsoever, unless he be God; (which as yet they do not assert): and so that the Romish doctrine concerning pardons is *a fond thing, and repugnant to the scriptures.* And so is also their doctrine

Concerning worshipping of Images.

Now what the Romish doctrine concerning images is, we have plainly set down by the council of Trent, even, [d] "That

---

hoc cuiquam hominum cum Christo esse commune ut peccata condonet. Solius hoc munus est Christi qui tulit peccatum mundi. Ambros. Epist. [26. ad Irenæum, vol. I. p. 894.] ad Studium.

[c] Πῶς δὲ, εἴπερ κτίσμα ἦν ὁ λόγος, τὴν ἀπόφασιν τοῦ Θεοῦ λῦσαι δυνατὸς ἦν, καὶ ἀφεῖναι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, γεγραμμένου παρὰ τοῖς προφήταις, ὅτι τοῦτο Θεοῦ ἐστι; τίς γὰρ Θεὸς ὥσπερ σὺ ἐξαίρων ἁμαρτίας καὶ ὑπερβαίνων ἀνομίας; ὁ μὲν γὰρ Θεὸς εἶπε, γῆ εἶ, καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ· οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι γεγόνασι θνητοί· πῶς γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν παρὰ τῶν γεννητῶν λυθῆναι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν; ἀλλ' ἔλυσέ γε αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος. Athanas. contra Arrian. orat. [2. p. 535.]

[d] Imagines porro Christi, deiparæ virginis, et aliorum sanctorum in templis præsertim habendas et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam. Concil. Trident. sess. 25. [vol. X.]

the images of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and that due honour and worship be given to them." And presently, [e] "Because the honour which is given to the images is referred to the prototypes which they represent; that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads and fall down, we adore Christ, and worship the saints whose likeness they bear." But Azorius tells us, [f] "It is the constant opinion of their divines, that the image ought to be honoured and worshipped with the same honour and worship wherewith that is worshipped which it is the image of." And so Bellarmine saith, [g] "That the images of Christ and the saints are to be worshipped, not only by accident and improperly, but by themselves and properly; so that themselves terminate the worship as they are considered in themselves, and not only as they represent that which they are the image of." And Petrus de Cabrera to the same purpose; [h] "Images are truly and properly to be worshipped, and from an intention of worshipping them, and not only the samplers represented in them." Yea, he tells us, [i] "That if images are worshipped only improperly, simply and absolutely they are not worshipped at all, neither are they to be worshipped, which is a manifest heresy."

Now what doctrine can possibly be invented to cross and contradict the scriptures more plainly than this doth? The scriptures expressly saying, yea, the great God in thunderings and lightnings commanding, *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor worship or serve them.* Exod. xx. 4, 5. For what image can possibly be made, and yet not come within the compass of this law? There is nothing in the world but it is either in heaven, or on earth, or under the earth; and so nothing in the world but the image of it is here expressly forbidden to be worshipped. I know the abettors and practisers of this Romish doctrine would persuade us, that the worshipping of heathenish idols is here only forbidden, not the adoration of images. But I could wish such seriously to consider with themselves that it is here said, *Thou shalt not make to thyself the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or earth beneath;* so that they are *things* which we are here forbidden to worship the image or likeness of: whereas *we know an idol is nothing in the world,* 1 Cor. viii. 4: and therefore it is not heathenish idols only that are here forbidden, but Christian idols also; I mean all images whatsoever, unless they will find out images of things that are neither in heaven nor earth, nor under the earth, that is, images of nothing. But we know the images they worship are the images of real things, of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, of saints; all which are somewhere; and therefore their images are expressly forbidden to be worshipped here. And howsoever the subtle doctors of the Romish church may make the ignorant people believe that it is only the heathenish idols that are here intended, I am sure the ancient [k] Fathers of the catholic Church looked upon all images whatsoever as here forbidden.

---

[e] Sed quoniam honos qui exhibetur, refertur ad prototypa quæ illæ repræsentant: ut per imagines quas osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus, et procumbimus, Christum adoremus, et sanctos, quorum illæ similitudinem gerunt, veneremur. Ibid.

[f] Constans est theologorum sententia imaginem eodem honore et cultu honorari et coli, quo colitur id cujus est imago. Atque hæc sententia non tantum unius Thomæ sed communi est theologorum consensu recepta. Azor. l. 9. instit. c. 6. art. 3, 6.

[g] Imagines Christi et sanctorum venerandæ sunt, non solum per accidens vel improprie, sed etiam per se et proprie, ita ut ipsæ terminent venerationem ut in se considerantur, et non solum ut vicem gerunt exemplaris. Bellarm. de imagin. l. 2. c. 21.

[h] Imagines sunt vere et proprie adorandæ et ex intentione ipsas adorandi, et non tantum exemplaria in ipsis repræsentata, Pet. de Cabrera in tert. part. Thom. quæst. 25. art. 3. disp. 2. num. 32.

[i] Si imagines improprie tantum adorantur, simpliciter et absolute non adorantur, neque sunt adorandæ, quod est hæresis manifesta. Ibid. num. 34.

---

[k] Quæ nunc Dei sermo universa complectens simul abjurat et abjicit, et non solum idolum fieri vetat, sed et similitudinem omnium quæ in terra sunt et in aquis et in cœlo. Origen. in Exod. [vol. II. p. 158.] Οὐχὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ ἐντειλάμενος διὰ Μωσέως, μητὲ εἰκόνα, μητὲ ὁμοίωμα, μητὲ τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ ἄνω, μητὲ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ὅλως ποιῆσαι: Justin. Dial. cum Tryphone [94.] Quomodo enim Moysen et Hiliam cognovisset nisi in spiritu? Nec enim imagines eorum vel statuas populus habuisset, lege prohibente. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 22. Ὥσπερ Μωυσῆς πρόπαλαι διαρρήδην ἐνομοθέτησεν, μηδὲν δεῖν γλυπτὸν, ἢ χωνευτὸν, ἢ πλαστὸν, ἢ γραπτὸν ἄγαλμά τε καὶ ἀπεικόνισμα ποιεῖσθαι, ὡς μὴ τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς προσανέχωμεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τὰ νοητὰ μετίωμεν. Clem. Alex. Stromat. 5. [p. 662.] To which we may also add that of Josephus, Ὁ δεύτερος κε-

Neither is this doctrine repugnant to scripture only, but even to reason itself. For if images are to be worshipped, it is either the image itself that is to be worshipped, as some of them hold; or the thing which is represented by the image is to be worshipped in it, as others dream. But first, that the image itself, consisting of wood or stone, or any other materials, is not to be worshipped for itself, is plain; for as so, they are senseless and [l] inanimate creatures, and so, much inferior unto man, who is not only animate but sensitive, and not only sensitive but rational too; by whom these very images are erected, carved, preserved; who can change, adorn, or destroy them whensoever himself pleaseth. And can it in reason be thought the superior should worship the inferior? and he that made the work, the work which himself made? Though all honour be not worship, yet all worship is honour; and honour is a thing that is not due from superiors to inferiors, but from inferiors to superiors. So that, as Athanasius [m] said of the heathenish idols, there is more reason that men their carvers should be worshipped by them, than that they should be worshipped by men. And therefore, for mine own part, I cannot see but that the heathens might have as much to say for their worshipping of idols, as the papists can have for their worshipping of images; for the heathens' idols were most of them images, and so are the papists' images all idols.

And as images are not to be worshipped simply in them-

λεύει μηδενὸς εἰκόνα ζώου ποιήσαντας προσκυνεῖν. Antiq. l. 3. c. [v. 5.] And Philo Judæus saith, The second commandment is, *Περὶ ξοάνων, καὶ ἀγαλμάτων, καὶ συνόλως ἀφιδρυμάτων χειροκμήτων.* Phil. de decal. [vol. II. p. 188.]

[l] Simulacra quidem sensuum domiciliis induta sunt, operatione vero privantur. Viliora igitur non modo sunt iis qui ipsa finxerunt, sed etiam minimis animantibus, quandoquidem musca et culices, et hisce tenuiores in sensuum sedibus vim habent; vident enim et audiunt, et volant, et ambulant. Theodor. in Psalm. 113. [vol. I. p. 863.]

[m] *Πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιότερον ἦν τὸν τεχνίτην αὐτοὺς προσκυνεῖν ἤπερ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πεποιημένα· ὅτι καὶ προϋπῆρχε τῶν ἐκ τέχνης θεῶν, καὶ ὅτι ὡς ἠβουλήθη οὕτω καὶ γεγόνασι.* Athanas. contra gentes, [13. vol. I.] To which we may also add that of Lactantius: Nec intelligunt homines ineptissimi, quod si sentire simulacra et moveri possent, ultro adoratura homines fuissent, a quibus sunt expolita, quæ essent aut incultus et horridus lapis aut materia informis et rudis, nisi fuissent ab homine formata. Lactant. de origin. error. [l. II. c. 2.]

selves, so neither ought they to be worshipped relatively, as they represent that which we ought to worship; for it is impossible that any thing which we ought to worship should be represented by an image: for, as we shall see presently, there is no person or thing in the world that ought to be religiously worshipped but only God: and it is impossible that God, an infinite Being, should be represented by an image, a finite creature. And seeing he cannot be represented by an image, he ought not to be worshipped in an image; neither, as [n] Origen well observed, can he be worshipped in images; for they cannot represent any more than a finite being, and therefore the infinite God cannot be worshipped in them. So that the worship that is given to God in images is so far from being worship, that it is rather dishonour; yea, practical blasphemy, making God of no higher a nature, nay, of a lower nature than ourselves; even such a one as a senseless block may represent, which it is impossible should represent so much as the soul, or better part of man.

And if they will not stand to scripture or reason, let them consult the Fathers, and they will find Origen saying, [o] "We do not honour images, that as much as in us lies we might not fall into the suspicion that those images were other gods." Yea, Clemens Alexandrinus saith, [p] "Moses commanded that no image should be made by man that might represent God artificially." And Gregory the Great saith plainly, [q] "If any one will make images, do not forbid him, but to worship images by all means avoid." Nay, Lactantius saith, [r] "Wherefore there is no doubt but there is no religion wheresoever there is an image. For if religion be of divine things, and yet there is nothing divine but [in] heavenly things; therefore images want religion, because there can be nothing heavenly in that thing which is made of the earth."

---

[n] *Ἀλλ' ἡ κοινὴ ἔννοια ἀπαιτεῖ ἐννοεῖν, ὅτι Θεὸς οὐδαμῶς ἐστιν ὕλη φθαρτὴ, οὐδὲ τιμᾶται ἐν ἀψύχοις ὕλαις, ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων μορφούμενος, ὡς κατ' εἰκόνα ἤ τινα σύμβολα ἐκείνου γιγνομέναις· διόπερ εὐθέως λέγεται τὰ περὶ ἀγαλμάτων, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ θεοὶ, καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων δημιουργημάτων, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ συγκριτὰ πρὸς τὸν δημιουργόν.* Origen. contra Cels. l. 3. [40.]

[o] *Οὐ τιμῶμεν τὰ ἀγάλματα, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ, τὸ ὅσον ἐφ' ἡμῖν, καταπίπτειν εἰς ὑπόληψιν τὴν περὶ τοῦ εἶναι τὰ ἀγάλματα θεοὺς ἑτέρους.* Origen. contra Cels. l. 7. [c. 66.]

[p] *Οὐδεμίαν εἰκόνα ὁ Μωϋσῆς παραγγέλλει ποιεῖσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀντίτεχνον τῷ Θεῷ.* Clem. Alex. Pædag. l. 3. c. 2. [p. 258.]

[q] Si quis imagines facere voluerit, minime prohibe; adorare vero imagines omnibus modis devita. Greg. Mag. Epist. l. [XI. ep. 13. vol. II.]

[r] Quare non est dubium quin religio nulla est ubicunque simulacrum est. Nam si religio ex divinis rebus est, divini autem nihil est nisi in cælestibus rebus, carent ergo religione simulacra, quia nihil potest esse cæleste in ea re quæ fit ex terra. Lactant. de orig. error. [l. II. c. 19.]

Or if they will not stand to the determination of the Fathers, let them refer it to councils, and they will find the Elibertine council determining, [s] "That pictures or images ought not to be in the church, lest that which is worshipped and adored should be painted upon the walls." And a council held at Constantinople, consisting of 338 bishops, anno Dom. 754, determined unanimously, [t] "That every image, made of what matter soever by the wicked art of the painter, be thrown out of Christian churches as strange and abominable." But there being another council held at Nice not many years after, it did as much extol images as the other had destroyed them, as we saw in the foregoing article. But not long after, Charles the Great gathered together the bishops of France, Germany, and Italy, into a council at Franckford, where, as Regino saith, [u] "the false synod of the Grecians, which they made for the worshipping of images, was rejected." I know this synod did condemn the Constantinopolitan council too before spoken of, because they stretched it too far, not only commanding that images should not be worshipped, but that they should not be used so much as for the ornament of the church. But as they condemned the Constantinopolitan council for throwing them quite out of the church, so did they condemn too the second council of Nice, for commanding them to be worshipped in the church. For not only Regino, before quoted, but Hincmarus Remensis expressly saith, [x] "Wherefore in the time of the emperor Charles the Great, by the command of the apostolical seat, a general council was celebrated in France, the said emperor gathering it together; and according to the way of the scriptures, and the tradition of the ancients, the false synod of the Grecians was destroyed and utterly cast off." To which we may add the book, attested by sufficient witnesses to be written by the said Charles the Great against the Nicene council, and worshipping of images; wherein he calls [y] "the religious worship of images a most insolent, or rather most superstitious and accursed adoration." And not only so, but the same renowned emperor sent the determinations of the said council into [z] Britain, to keep them from that gross idolatry too. And the worshipping of images was condemned again in another council at Constantinople, an. 814: and in another council, held at Paris, an. 824, under Lodovicus, the son and immediate successor of Charles the Great, it was again determined, as in the council of Franckford, that it was lawful to have images, but unlawful to worship them. So that it is no new thing that our reverend convocation did, when they determined that the worshipping of images is a fond thing, and repugnant to the Word of God. And what is said concerning worshipping of images is said also

---

[s] Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur in parietibus depingatur. Concil. Elibert. cap. 36. [Hard. Conc. vol. I.]

[t] Una voce definimus omnem imaginem, ex quacunque materia improba pictorum arte factam, ab ecclesia Christianorum rejiciendam, veluti alienam et abominabilem. Act. Concil. Constant. [Id. vol. IV. p. 725.]

[u] Pseudosynodus Græcorum quam pro adorandis imaginibus fecerunt, rejecta est. Regino in Chron. [vol. I. p. 31.]

[x] Tempore Caroli magni imperatoris, jussione apostolicæ sedis, generalis synodus in Francia, convocante præfato imperatore celebrata,

Concerning the worshipping of Relics.

What we are to understand by relics in this place Stapleton tells us, [a] "Even not only every part or particular of a saint's body, but even his garments, or any thing else which he used." And Bellarmine tells us, [b] "The very cross upon

---

et secundum scripturarum tramitem traditionemque majorum, ipsa Græcorum pseudosynodus destructa et penitus abdicata est. Hincmar. Rhemen. l. contra Hincmar. Laudun. c. 20. [vol. II. p. 457.]

[y] Cultum religiosum imaginum insolentissimam vel potius superstitiosissimam execrandamque adorationem. Carol. Mag. l. 2. c. 13.

[z] Carolus rex Francorum misit librum synodalem ad Britanniam, in quo veræ fidei multa reperta sunt obviantia, et eo maxime quod pene omnium orientalium doctorum unanimi assertione est definitum, imagines adorari debere, quod omnino ecclesia catholica execratur. Mat. Westmonast. ad an. 793.

[a] Ad reliquias alicujus sancti pertinet non solum quælibet sui corporis particula, sed etiam vestes, aut aliquod aliud quo usus fuerat. Staplet. part. 1. Prompt. cath.

[b] Crux illa vera in qua Dominus pependit, propter contactum sacri

which the Lord hung, by reason of its touching his sacred body and blood, is to be reckoned amongst the most precious relics; and not only the whole, but every piece of it." And what the Romish doctrine concerning these relics is, we may see in several of their writers. Jodocus Coccius tells us, [c] "The relics of the saints are to be religiously preserved and worshipped." Johannes de Turrecremata, [d] "That the relics of the cross, nails, spear, garments, and the image of Christ crucified, are to be worshipped with *latria*," or the same worship that is proper to the true God. To name no more, the council of Trent declares, [e] "That the holy bodies of the holy martyrs, and others that live with Christ, which were the living members of Christ, and the temples of the Holy Ghost, to be raised up by him to eternal life and glorified, are to be worshipped by the faithful, by which many benefits are performed to men. So that all such as affirm that honour and worship ought not to be given to the relics of the saints, or that they and other monuments are unprofitably honoured by the faithful, and that for the obtaining of their help the memories of the saints are vainly frequented, are to be altogether condemned."

Now, what need we to retort to the upholders of these doctrines more than what our Saviour did to the Devil, *Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve?* Matt. iv. 10. If God be alone to be served and worshipped, what worship can be due to these so venerable relics? What is it less than sacrilege, to give that glory to the creature which is due only to the

---

corporis et sanguinis, inter pretiosissimas reliquias habenda est, nec solum ipsa integra sed etiam particulæ ejus. Bellar. de imag. l. 2. c. 26. [vol. II.]

[c] Sanctorum reliquias religiose servandas et colendas esse. Jod. Coccius, Thes. l. 5. art. 16. [tit.]

[d] Reliquiæ crucis, clavorum, lanceæ, vestium Christi, et imago crucifixi sunt latria veneranda. Joh. de Turrec. in festo invent. crucis, q. 3.

[e] Sanctorum quoque martyrum et aliorum cum Christo viventium sancta corpora, quæ viva membra fuerint Christi, et templa Spiritus Sancti, ab ipso ad æternam vitam suscitanda et glorificanda, a fidelibus veneranda esse, per quæ multa beneficia a Deo hominibus præstantur. Ita ut affirmantes sanctorum reliquiis venerationem atque honorem non deberi, vel eas aliaque sacra monumenta a fidelibus inutiliter honorari, atque eorum opis impetrandæ causa sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari, omnino damnandos esse. Concil. Trident. sess. 25. [vol. X. p. 168.]

Creator? St. Paul reproves the Romish heathens for *worshipping the creature more than the Creator*, Rom. i. 25. Certainly the same reproof may reach to the Romish Christians too. For what is due only to the Creator, they are not ashamed nor afraid to give it to the creature, and so either making God a creature, or the creature a god, by giving no more to God than they give to the creatures, nor less to the creatures than they give to God. They can give no more than religious worship to God, and that they give to the creatures, and so must needs bring either the glory of God down, so as to be no higher than the glory of a creature, or the glory of the creature up, so as to be no lower than the glory of God, by making God and the creature to be sharers in the same honour.

Let them therefore tell me, are these relics creatures or no? If they will assert and prove them to be no creatures, they may well be worshipped; and if they worship them, they do in that assert them to be no creatures: for certainly [f] none but God ought to be worshipped; and whatsoever may be truly worshipped is God. If they may be worshipped, they are not creatures; and if they be not creatures, they ought to be worshipped. I say therefore, are these relics creatures or no? Are they creatures, did I say? Certainly if they were not, our adversaries would never contend so much that they ought to be worshipped; for we can scarce find any of them spending so much time in proving that Jehovah, the Creator, should be worshipped, as they do in proving that images and relics, and almost any thing besides God, ought to be worshipped. But let them at the length bethink themselves, whether in reason their bodies should be worshipped, whose souls, for ought they know, may be in hell? or whether in reason any part of that cross should be worshipped upon which Christ was crucified? The cross was the wicked instrument which the Jews used to put our Saviour to death; what? and must that be now worshipped by such as profess faith in him that was crucified upon it? And are the nails that fastened his hands and feet to the cross, and the spear that pierced his sides, such honourable things that they must be worshipped too? How comes such honour to be conferred upon these nails and this spear? What? because they were the instruments of our Saviour's death and greater torments? Oh most horrid impiety and unparalleled idolatry, that Christians should worship that which tormented and destroyed Christ! that we should worship that in our life, that brought our Saviour himself to death!

---

[f] And thus we find the Fathers themselves using the argument both ways; sometimes saying such a thing is to be worshipped, and therefore it is God, and such a thing is not God, and therefore it ought not to be worshipped: as, Εἰ μὲν γὰρ οὐ προσκυνητὸν, πῶς ἐμὲ θεοῖ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος; εἰ δὲ προσκυνητὸν, πῶς οὐ σεπτόν; εἰ δὲ σεπτὸν, πῶς οὐ θεός; ἓν ἤρτηται τοῦ ἑνός· χρυσῆ τις ὄντως σειρὰ καὶ σωτήριος. Greg. Nazianz. [vol. I. p. 609.] orat. 37. de Spir. S. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ προσκυνεῖν τῆς κτίσεως, τὸ δὲ προσκυνεῖσθαι τοῦ τῆς κτίσεως δεσπότου. Chrysost. in Joh. hom. 33. [vol. II. p. 687. 39.] And on the other side, Εἰ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ Θεὸς οὔτε προσκυνητός ἐστι· καὶ εἰ ἔστι κτιστὸς, οὐ θεός· καὶ εἰ οὐκ ἐστὶ προσκυνητὸς, πῶς ἄρα θεολογεῖται; Epiphan. in Arium. [adv. hæres. II. ii. vol. I. p. 755.]

And if they will not believe us, that no relics, but God only is to be worshipped, let them consult the Fathers, and see their opinion in it. And if they will not take the pains to look themselves into the Fathers, I hope they will not be angry if I tell them that Justin Martyr saith, [g] "We worship God only; but as to other things we joyfully obey you," viz. emperors. And Theophilus Antiochenus: [h] "The divine law doth not only forbid us to worship idols, but the elements also, sun, moon, and the other stars. So that we must not worship heaven, nor earth, nor the sea, nor fountains, nor rivers; but we ought to worship the true God only, and Maker of all things, in simplicity of heart, and sincerity of mind." And therefore saith Tatianus also, [i] "I will never worship the workmanship that was made for our sakes." And presently, [j] "I will never be persuaded myself, nor persuade another, to worship the substance of the elements."

---

[g] *Ὅθεν θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν, ὑμῖν δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα χαίροντες ὑπηρετοῦμεν.* Justin. apol. [I. 17.]

[h] *Ὁ μὲν οὖν θεῖος νόμος οὐ μόνον κωλεύει τὸ τοῖς εἰδώλοις προσκυνεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχείοις, ἡλίῳ, σελήνῃ, ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἄστροις· ἀλλ' οὔτε τῷ οὐρανῷ, οὔτε γῇ, οὔτε θαλάσσῃ, ἢ πηγαῖς, ἢ ποταμοῖς θρησκεύειν, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνῳ τῷ ὄντως θεῷ καὶ ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων χρὴ λατρεύειν, ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, καὶ εἰλικρινεῖ γνώμῃ.* Theoph. Antioch. ad Autol. l. 2. [50.]

[i] *Δημιουργίαν τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γενομένην χάριν ἡμῶν προσκυνεῖν οὐ θέλω.* Tatian. ad Græc. [7.]

[j] *Σέβειν τῶν στοιχείων τὴν ὑπόστασιν οὐκ ἂν πεισθείην, οὔτ' ἂν πείσαιμι τὸν πλησίον.* Ibid. [36.]

Origen also saith plainly, [k] "If we may speak briefly, and all at once, it is the fault of impiety, or it is very wickedness, to worship any one whomsoever, besides Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." And so Theodoret: [l] "Of men," saith he, "such as excel in virtue we honour as the best of men; but we worship only the God of all, the Father, and his Son, and the All-holy Ghost." And so Lactantius saith, [m] "There is no religion or veneration to be had of any but of the one God." I might produce many more, but these witnesses may be enough to prove that it is God only that ought to be worshipped, and no creature whatsoever; and if no creature, much less ought the relics of creatures to be worshipped, as [n] Gregory Nazianzen saith:

An impure sacrifice is sin, much more
The relics of a dead man to adore.

It is a sin to worship the best of creatures instead of God: and shall it be thought no sin to worship the relics of creatures instead of him? Certainly if there be any doctrines in the world repugnant to the word of God, this and the former are to be reckoned as the principal of them all; whereby not only creatures, but the very images and relics of creatures, are held to have the worship of the true God due unto them. And so we pass from these to the last of the Romish doctrines here spoken of, and that is

Concerning the invocation of saints.

And to know what the Romish doctrine concerning the invocation of saints is, we need go no further than the council of Trent; who there teach plainly, and command all their bishops to teach, [o] "That the saints reigning with Christ do offer up their prayers for men; that it is good and useful to invocate or pray unto them, and for the obtaining benefits from God by his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Mediator and Saviour, to fly to their prayers, help, and assistance. But such as deny that those that enjoy eternal happiness in heaven are to be called upon, or that assert either that they do not pray for men, or that to call upon them to pray for every one of us is idolatry, or to be repugnant to the word of God, and to derogate from the honour of the one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ, or that it is a foolish thing to pray to such as reign in heaven with our voice or minds, do think impiously." Now though we do not here say, that this their doctrine concerning the saints praying for us is so; yet we say, that this their doctrine concerning our praying to the saints is a fond thing, and repugnant to the scriptures.

---

[k] Ut breviter et omni in unum collecta definitione dicamus, adorare alium quempiam præter Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, impietatis est crimen. Origen. in Rom. l. 1. [16. vol. IV.]

[l] *Τῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων τοὺς ἐν ἀρετῇ διαπρέψαντας ὡς ἀνθρώπους ἀρίστους γεραίρομεν· μόνον δὲ τῶν ὅλων προσκυνοῦμεν θεὸν, καὶ πατέρα, καὶ τὸν ἐκείνου γὲ λόγον, καὶ τὸ πανάγιον πνεῦμα.* Theodor. therap. 2. [p. 503. vol. IV.]

[m] Religio et veneratio nulla nisi unius Dei tenenda est. Lactant. de falsa relig. [vol. I. p. 88.]

[n] *Ὕβρις ἀνάγνον ἐόντα παρεστάμεναι θυέεσθαι,*
Δεινότερον νεκύων λείψανα πάντα σέβειν.
Greg. Nazian. in dist. [vol. II. p. 146.]

And certainly it is so; for what else means that place of scripture, *How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?* Rom. x. 14. That none is to be believed in but God, though others may be believed besides God, I suppose they will not deny; or if they do, I would wish them to cast their eye a little upon the margin, and [p] there they will see several of the Fathers making this distinction betwixt believing in a person, and believing of a person, that the first is proper and peculiar to God only, the other common also unto men. So that I may believe a man, but I am to believe in none but God. And if so, then from this place it clearly follows, that seeing the saints in heaven are not to be believed in, they are not to be called upon; but that we are to call upon none but God, because we are to believe in none but God. And hence it is, that when the disciples came to our Saviour to direct and instruct them how to pray, he bad them say daily, *Our Father which art in heaven*, Matt. vi. 9. Luke xi. 2: wherein he directs them not only what they should pray for, but whom to pray to; not to this, or that, or the other saint, but to God, *Our Father which art in heaven.*

---

[o] Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes orationes suas pro hominibus offerre, bonum atque utile esse eos invocare, et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Filium ejus Jesum Christum, Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster redemptor et salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere; illos vero, qui negant æterna fælicitate in cœlo fruentes invocandos esse, aut qui asserunt vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent invocationem esse idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi, vel stultum esse in cœlo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare, impie sentire. Concil. Trident. sess. 25. [vol. X. p. 168.]

[p] *Οὐ ταυτόν ἐστι πιστεύειν εἰς τὶ καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ πιστεύειν. τὸ μὲν γάρ ἐστι θεότητος, τὸ δὲ παντὸς πράγματος.* Greg. Nazianz. orat. 37. [vol. I. p. 596.] Sciendum est, quod ecclesiam credere non tamen in ecclesiam credere debeamus, quia ecclesia non est Deus, sed domus Dei est. Serm. de tempore [242. Aug. vol. V. App.] Hoc est enim credere in Deum quod utique plus est quam credere Deo, nam et homini cuilibet plerumque credendum est, quamvis in eum non sit credendum. Aug. in Psal. 77. [8. vol. IV.] Rursus etiam de apostolis ipsius possumus dicere, Credimus Paulo, sed non credimus in Paulum, Credimus Petro, sed non credimus in Petrum. Id. in Joh. tract. 29. [6. vol. III. par. ii.] Hac igitur præpositionis syllaba (in) creator a creaturis secernitur, et divina separantur ab humanis. Ruf-

But I need not insist any longer upon this, having proved before that it is God that is the only person in the world that ought to be religiously worshipped: for from thence it plainly follows, that God is only to be prayed to: for invocation is the principal part of religious worship, insomuch that it is sometimes put for the whole: as when the place of God's worship is called a house of prayer, Isa. lvi. 7; viz. because it is prayer that is the chief worship that is performed in it. And therefore [q] Origen saith, "That to call upon the name of

---

fin. in expos. symbol. [p. 26.] Credere et Petro et Paulo jure debemus, in Petrum vero et Paulum credere, id est in servos conferre honorem domini non debemus. Credere illi quilibet potest homini. Credere vero in illum soli te debere noveris majestati. Euseb. Emisen. de symb. hom. 2. [Max. Bibl. patr. vol. VI. p. 630.]

[q] Et si invocare Domini nomen et adorare Deum unum atque idem est, sicut invocatur Christus et adorandus est Christus. Origen. in Rom. l. 8. [5. vol. IV. p. 624.] And therefore doth St. Chrysostome join prayer and divine worship together, as, Πολλῷ μᾶλλον εὐχὴ καὶ λατρεία Θεοῦ σημεῖόν ἐστι δικαιοσύνης ἁπάσης. Chrysost. de oratione, hom. 1. [vol. VI. p. 756.] Ἵνα πάντα τὸν χρόνον ταῖς προσευχαῖς καὶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ λατρείᾳ καὶ μελέτῃ συζῶμεν. Ibid. [p. 754.] Ἵνα τοὺς μὲν εἰωθότας ζῆν ἐν προσευχαῖς καὶ λατρείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ibid. hom. 2. [init.] And therefore he sometimes puts one for another, yea, λατρεία for προσευχὴ, as, Διόπερ χρὴ καὶ τῆς κλίνης ἀπανισταμένους φθάνειν ἀεὶ τὸν ἥλιον τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ λατρείᾳ, καὶ τραπέζης ἁπτομένους, καὶ καθεύδειν μέλλοντας. Ibid. hom. 1. [p. 757.] And what he there means by λατρεία he expresseth in the following words, Μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην ὥραν μίαν εὐχὴν τῷ θεῷ προσφέροντας, ἴσον τῇ ἡμέρᾳ δρόμον τρέχοντας. Ibid. And therefore he adds, Ἐν δὲ γὲ τῇ τοῦ χειμῶνος ὥρᾳ καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος εἰς προσευχὰς ἀναλίσκοντας, καὶ τὰ γόνατα κάμπτοντας σὺν πολλῷ τῷ φόβῳ τῇ δεήσει προσέχοντας, μακαρίζοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ λατρείᾳ. Ibid.

the Lord or to worship him, is one and the same thing." So that he alone may be worshipped that is to be called upon; and he alone may be called upon who may be worshipped. And so he that may not be worshipped ought not to be called upon; and therefore seeing it is not lawful to worship the saints, it cannot be lawful to call upon them.

And whatsoever our adversaries may boast, yet certainly the Fathers did not hold that the saints departed should be prayed to, as appears from the descriptions which they give of prayer. St. Basil saith, [r] "Prayer is the desire of something that is good, made by holy persons to God;" not to the saints, but to God immediately. And so Damascen saith, [s] "Prayer is the ascension of the mind to God, or the desire of convenient things from God." And therefore saith St. Chrysostome, [t] "Every one that prays discourseth with God." [u] "When thou readest," saith Gilbertus, "thou art taught by Christ, but when thou prayest thou talkest familiarly with him." So that it seems they did not think we should go to any of the courtiers of heaven to speak to the King for us, but that we should speak to him ourselves.

Nay, and Origen saith expressly, [v] "For we must pray only to the most high God, and we must pray to his only begotten and the firstborn of every creature, even the Word of God, and beseech him as our High Priest to present our prayer, that comes to him, to his God and our God, to his Father and the Father of all those that live according to the word of God." And elsewhere: [x] "Every prayer, and supplication, and intercession, and giving of thanks, is to be sent up to the God that is above all, by him that is above all angels, even our High Priest, the living Word and God; and let us pray the Word himself, and beseech him, and give thanks to him." So that it is Christ, not the saints, that is to present our prayers to God. To which we may add that of Gregorius Thaumaturgus: [y] "He that rightly calls upon God calls upon him by his Son, and he that comes near to him comes by Christ; but none can come to the Son but by the Holy Spirit." Hitherto we may refer that also of Tertullian: [z] "These things," saith he, "I can pray for of none else but him from whom I know I shall obtain them, and it is he that alone performeth for me, and I am such a one to whom it belongs to pray, his servant who observe him alone, who am killed for his discipline." And this is the argument whereby Athanasius proves against Arius that Christ is God, because he is prayed to: [a] "For none," saith he, "would pray to receive any thing from the Father and the angels, or any other creatures:" so that we are to join no creatures with God in our daily prayers. And truly if we are to pray to any creatures in heaven, why not to the angels as well as saints? yet the council of Laodicea determined long ago, [b] "That it is not lawful for Christians to leave the church of God, and name angels, and make congregations, which [things] are forbidden; and if any one therefore be found to follow this secret idolatry, let him be accursed, because he hath left the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and gone to idolatry." The occasion of which canon Balsamon saith was, [c] "Because that the devil suggested sometimes to some, that Christ was not to be called upon for help, but the angels." So that it is calling upon angels that is here accursed; and therefore Theodoret saith, [d] "The synod which met at Laodicea, which is the metropolis of Phrygia, forbad by a law, that none should pray to the angels." So that praying to angels was so long ago forbidden as idolatry, as cursed idolatry. And what shall we then say to that doctrine that saith we must pray to saints? Certainly we can do no less than conclude it to be a fond thing, and repugnant to the word of God, and say with the ancient council at Franckford, [e] "That no saints should be either worshipped or invocated or prayed to by us."

---

[r] *Προσευχή ἐστιν αἴτησις ἀγαθοῦ παρὰ τῶν εὐσεβῶν εἰς θεὸν γινομένη.* Basil. hom. in mart. Julit. [vol. I. p. 318.]

[s] *Προσευχή ἐστιν ἀνάβασις νοῦ πρὸς θεὸν, ἢ αἴτησις τῶν προσηκόντων παρὰ θεοῦ.* Damasc. de orthod. fid. l. 3. c. 24.

[t] *Πᾶς προσευχόμενος τῷ θεῷ διαλέγεται.* Chrys. de orat. hom. 2. [init.]

[u] Cum legis, erudiris de Christo, orans vero, familiare cum ipso seris colloquium. Gilbert. in Cant. serm. 7.

[v] *Μόνῳ γὰρ προσευκτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ, καὶ προσευκτέον γὲ τῷ μονογενεῖ καὶ πρωτοτόκῳ πάσης κτίσεως λόγῳ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀξιωτέον αὐτὸν ὡς ἀρχιερέα, τὴν ἐπ' αὐτὸν φθάσασάν ἡμῶν εὐχὴν ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ θεὸν ἡμῶν, καὶ πατέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πατέρα τῶν βιούντων κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.* Origen. contra Cels. l. 8. [26. vol. I.]

[x] *Πᾶσαν μὲν δέησιν, καὶ προσευχὴν, καὶ ἔντευξιν, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἀναπεμπτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερέως, ἐμψύχου λόγου καὶ θεοῦ· δεησόμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐντευξόμεθα αὐτῷ καὶ εὐχαριστήσομεν.* Ibid. l. 5. [4.]

---

[y] Qui recte invocat Deum, per Filium invocat, et qui prope accedit, per Christum accedit, accedere autem ad filium non potest sine Spiritu Sancto. Greg. Thaum. exp. fid. [p. 98.]

[z] Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quam a quo me scio consequuturum, quoniam et ipse est qui solus præstat, et ego sum cui impetrare debetur, famulus ejus qui eum solum observo, qui propter disciplinam ejus occidor. Tertull. apol. c. 30. [vol. V.]

[a] Οὐκ ἂν γοῦν εὔξαιτό τις λαβεῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἢ παρὰ τίνος τῶν ἄλλων κτισμάτων. Athanas. contra Arian. orat. [III. 12.]

[b] Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν, καὶ συνάξεις ποιεῖν ἅπερ ἀπηγόρευται· εἴ τις οὖν εὑρεθῇ ταύτῃ τῇ κεκρυμμένῃ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ σχολάζων, ἔστω ἀνάθεμα, ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπε τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ προσῆλθεν. Concil. Laod. can. 35. [Hard. Conc. vol. I. p. 787.]

[c] Διά τοι τοῦτο καὶ ὑπέβαλλέ ποτε

τινὰς μὴ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς βοηθείαν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. Balsam. in loc. [apud Bever. Synod. vol. I. p. 468.]

[d] Synodus, quæ convenit Laodiceæ, quæ est Phrygiæ metropolis, lege prohibuit ne precarentur angelos. Theodoret. in Colos. c. 2. [vol. III. p. 355.]

[e] Ut nulli nobis sancti colantur aut invocentur. Concil. Francof. can. 42. [Hard. Conc. vol. IV. p. 908.]

ARTICLE XXIII.

OF MINISTERING IN THE CONGREGATION.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

THE church of God, as we have seen, art. XIX, *is a congregation of faithful men, wherein the word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered.* In this article therefore we have it determined who are those who are to preach the word and administer the sacraments in the church; not every one that hath a mind to it, not every one that fancies himself fit for it; no, only such as are lawfully called thereunto. Now though there be but one God men are called to this office by, yet there be two ways which he is pleased to call them in. Some he calls immediately from himself without men; others mediately from himself by men. The first manner of calling to this sacred office the prophets and apostles had, who were all, as St. Paul saith of himself, *called not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father*, Gal. i. 1. The prophets had this immediate call from God under the law, and the apostles from Christ under the gospel. And as they were called immediately by Christ, so were others called immediately by them. So that Christ called the apostles, [a] the apostles by the appointment of the same Christ called others to succeed them, they again others; and so hath there been a succession of lawful ministers ever since, which though they were not all called immediately by Christ, yet they were all called by him, yea and all others are their successors who had this immediate call from him. So that none are now lawful ministers but such as are thus called by him, and all that are thus called by him are lawful ministers; I mean all such as are called by such as succeed them in the ministry, who were called immediately from Christ himself: for these are they which certainly we are to understand by those mentioned in this article, *who have public authority given unto them in the congregation or church, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.* But of this we shall speak more by the blessing of God in the XXXVIth article, where we shall treat of the consecration of bishops and ministers.

But the principal thing to be demonstrated here is, that without some such call from God it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering, or in general the office of a ministry. And for the proof of this, we might go no further than that remarkable passage in St. Paul, *How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?* Rom. x. 14, 15. Where we may observe how the apostle links several precious truths together, every one of which is as much a truth as any of them; and therefore, as it is certain that a man cannot call on him in whom he hath not believed, nor believe in him of whom he hath not heard, nor hear unless there be a preacher, so certain is it, that a man cannot lawfully preach unless he be sent: for this is an honour that *no man taketh*

---

[a] Καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς· διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν (ισ. ἀπονομὴν) δεδώκασιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Clement. epist. ad Corinth. p. 57.

to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron, Heb. v. 4. And therefore God complains of such prophets as run before they be sent, and preach his word to others before they have received power from him: *I have not sent these prophets*, saith he, *and yet they ran: I have not spoken unto them, yet they have prophesied.* Jer. xxiii. 21. And therefore he commands his people, saying, *Hearken not to the words of the prophets that speak unto you*, xxvii. 14, *for I sent them not*, ver. 15. So that such as God doth not send, man is not bound to hear. Did I say, man is not bound to hear? Nay, man is bound not to hear. And if man is bound not to hear those whom God hath not sent, certainly those that he doth not send are bound not to preach.

And he that further considers the several titles that are given to the ministers of God in the holy scripture, may have good ground to subscribe to this truth: for they are called *stewards*, Tit. i. 7. Now it doth not belong to every man that will to be a steward, unless he be appointed by him whose steward he is to be, Luke xii. 42. Again, they are called *ambassadors*, 2 Cor. v. 20. And who dare undertake an embassage to a foreign prince or people without a commission from his own king? Yea, the very words used by the Holy Ghost to express them by, do all imply office; as, bishops, ministers, deacons. Now there is no office that lies open in common to all, but a man must be particularly appointed and commissionated by him that hath power to do it, before he can be put into it, or invested with it. And hence it is also, that we find in scripture several rules laid down for the choosing of men into this office, 1 Tim. iii. 2, 3, 4. iv. 14. Tit. i. 5. 9. Whereas, if any one might take upon him this office, these rules and directions would be altogether superfluous. To all which we might also consider, what confusion and disorder the church would fall into, should any one, that thought himself a man gifted for it, undertake this sacred office? And truly of this we have had too many years of sad and woful experience, when ministers turned laymen, and laymen turned ministers, till at length we were likely to have all ministers and no laymen, or rather all laymen and no ministers: and the only way to keep us from returning to that disorder is by adhering to this truth, [b]that every man should look to his own business, and follow his own calling; he that is called to the clergy, to preach like one that is called to the clergy; and he that is one of the laity, to hear like one of the laity; every man keeping within the bounds which the great God hath placed him in, not undertaking the office of the ministry, unless he be lawfully called unto it.

The Fathers do offer themselves also to be witnesses in this case, but I shall trouble but these few for the present. As for the sacraments, St. Basil saith, [c]"But they being far from us, (and laymen,) have no power to baptize or ordain." [d]"For that," saith Athanasius, "is the office only of those that are over the catholic church: for it belongs to you, and to you only, and to none else, to give to drink of the blood of Christ." St. Chrysostome joins both sacraments together: [e]"But," saith he, "if none can enter into the kingdom of heaven unless he be born again of water and the Spirit, and he that eateth not the flesh of the Lord and drinketh his blood is cast out of eternal life, but all these things cannot be performed by any one else, but only by those holy hands, I mean the priest's, how can any one without them either shun the fire of hell, or be made partaker of the crowns that are set before us?" So that it is the priests or ministers only, and none else, that can administer either of the sacraments. And therefore [f]Athanasius pleads it was no sacramental cup that Ischyras consecrated, he being not lawfully ordained; and [g] Socrates, that this Ischyras committed a crime worthy of many deaths, in presuming to do the work of a minister, not being ordained.

---

[b] *Τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδομέναι εἰσὶ, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προστέτακται, καὶ λευΐταις ἰδίαι διακονίαι ἐπίκεινται· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται· ἕκαστος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοὶ, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐχαριστείτω θεῷ, ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὡρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα ἐν σεμνότητι.* Clem. Rom. epist. ad Corinth. p. 53.

[c] *Οἱ δὲ ἀπορραγέντες γενόμενοι, οὔτε τοῦ βαπτίζειν, οὔτε τοῦ χειροτονεῖν εἶχον ἐξουσίαν.* Basil. epist. ad Amphil. [III. p. 21.]

[d] *Τοῦτο μόνον ἐστι τῶν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας προεστώτων· μόνον γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστι προπίνειν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων οὐδενός.* Athanas. apol. [contra Arianos, 11. vol. I. p. 133.]

[e] *Εἰ γὰρ οὐ δύναταί τις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐὰν μὴ δι' ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος ἀναγεννηθῇ, καὶ ὁ μὴ τρώγων τὴν σάρκα τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ πίνων, ἐκβέβληται τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, πάντα δὲ ταῦτα δι' ἑτέρου μὲν οὐδενὸς, μόνον δὲ διὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων ἐπιτελεῖται χειρῶν, τῶν τοῦ ἱερέος λέγω, πῶς ἂν τις τούτων ἐκτὸς ἢ τὸ τῆς γεεννῆς ἐκφυγεῖν δυνήσεται πῦρ, ἢ τῶν ἀποκειμένων στεφάνων τυχεῖν.* Chrysost. *περὶ ἱερωσύνης, λογ. γ.* [vol. VI. p. 16.]

[f] *Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὐχ ὅτι κἂν σχισματικῶν ποτήριον κέκλασται*

And as for preaching the word, Cyril of Alexandria saith, [h] "God distributeth the use of the trumpets in preaching of the word only to such as are consecrated." But to this we have above two hundred Fathers met together in the Trullan council subscribing: for they there determined, [i] "That it is not lawful for a layman to dispute or to teach publicly, taking there to himself the power or dignity of preaching, but to remain in the order which the Lord hath set him in, and to open his ear to such as have received the grace of teaching, and to learn divine things from them. For in one church God hath made divers or different members, according to the words of the apostle, &c. *But if any one shall be taken weakening or transgressing this canon, let him be separated forty days.*" Many more of the like testimonies from the ancients I might produce, but these are enough from whence to conclude, that *it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of the ministry, unless he be lawfully called thereunto.*

παρὰ Μακαρίου, ἀλλ' ὅτι μηδὲν ἦν ὅλως ἐκεῖ· πῶς γάρ; ὅπου μήτε τόπος κυριακῆς, μήτε τις ἐκεῖ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλὰ μήτε ὁ καιρὸς μυστηρίων ἦν· οὗτος δὲ ἔστιν ὁ πολυθρύλλητος Ἰσχύρας, ὁ μήτε ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας χειροτονηθεὶς, καὶ ὅτε τοὺς ὑπὸ Μελιτίου κατασταθέντας πρεσβυτέρους Ἀλέξανδρος ἐδέχετο. Athanas. apol. [Ibid. p. 134.]

[g] Ἐν δὲ τῷ Μαρεώτῃ τούτῳ Ἰσχύρας τὶς οὕτω καλούμενος πρᾶγμα ὑπέδυ πολλῶν θανάτων ἄξιον. Οὐδὲ πώποτε γὰρ ἱεροσύνης τυχὼν τὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου ὄνομα ἑαυτῷ περιθέμενος τὰ ἱερέως πράττειν ἐτόλμησε. Socrat. hist. eccles. l. 1. c. [27.]

[h] Ἐπιτήρει δὲ ὅτι μόνοις ἀπονέμει τοῖς ἱερᾶσθαι λαχοῦσι τὸ κεχρῆσθαι ταῖς σάλπιγξιν. Cyril. Alex. de adoratione in spir. et verit. [l. v. vol. I. p. 168.]

[i] Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ δημοσίᾳ λαϊκὸν λόγον κινεῖν ἢ διδάσκειν, ἀξίωμα ἑαυτῷ διδασκαλικὸν ἐντεῦθεν περιποιούμενον, ἀλλ' εἴκειν τῇ παραδοθείσῃ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τάξει, καὶ τὸ οὖς τοῖς τὴν χάριν τοῦ διδασκαλικοῦ λαβοῦσι λόγου διανοίγειν, καὶ τὰ θεῖα παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκδιδάσκεσθαι. Ἐν γὰρ τῇ μιᾷ ἐκκλησίᾳ διάφορα μέλη πεποίηκεν ὁ Θεὸς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀποστόλου φωνὴν, &c. Εἰ δέ τις ἁλῷ τὸν παρόντα παρασαλεύων κανόνα, ἐπὶ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα ἀφοριζέσθω. Concil. Trul. can. 64. [Hard. Conc. vol. III. p. 1685.]

ARTICLE XXIV.

OF SPEAKING IN THE CONGREGATION IN SUCH A TONGUE AS THE PEOPLE UNDERSTANDETH.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive church, to have public prayer in the church, and to administer the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.

IT was determined in the council of Trent, that [a] "Though the mass" (so they call both their public prayers, and the sacrament of the Lord's supper too, called often by the [b] ancients the eucharist) "contains a great instruction of the faithful people, yet it doth not seem expedient to the Fathers that it should be every where celebrated in the vulgar tongue." And as if they had not said enough there, they add presently, [c] "If any one say that the rite or custom of the church of Rome, whereby part of the canon and words of the consecration are uttered with a low voice, is to be condemned; or that mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue, or that water ought not to be mixed with the wine in the cup that is to be offered up, because it is contrary to Christ's institution; let him be accursed." In which words they first [d] transgress the ancient law of Justinian the emperor, that public prayers and offerings should be performed with a loud voice, so as to be heard of the people; and then they add sin unto sin, and command that they be not made in any tongue but an unknown tongue. First, they decree it should be so performed, that the people might not hear it; and then, that it should be so performed, that if they did hear it, they might not understand it.

---

[a] Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur. Concil. Trident. sess. 22. cap. 8. [vol. X. p. 128.]

[b] *Ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία.* Justin. Mart. apol. [I. 66.] Nostra consonans est sententia eucharistiæ, et eucharistia rursus confirmat sententiam nostram. Iren. l. 4. c. [18. 5.] *Ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τῆς εὐχαριστίας.* Cyril. Hieros. catech. [mystag.] 1. [4.] *Ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναδείξει τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας.* Basil. de Spir. S. c. [27.] Cum tremore et honore eucharistiam accipiendam. Cyprian. ad Quirin. l. 3. c. [94. p. 55.] *Διὰ δὴ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ φρικώδη μυστήρια, καὶ πολλῆς γέμοντα τῆς σωτηρίας τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην τελούμενα (λέγω) σύναξιν, εὐχαριστία καλεῖται, ὅτι πολλῶν ἐστιν εὐεργετημάτων ἀνάμνησις.* Chrysost. in Mat. hom. [25. vol. II. p. 178. 35.]

[c] Si quis dixerit ecclesiæ Romanæ ritum, quo summissa voce pars canonis et verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse, aut lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere, aut aquam non miscendam vino in calice offerendo, eo quod sit contra Christi institutionem, anathema sit. Conc. Trident. sess. 22. can. 9. [Ibid. p. 129.]

Now against this vain and sinful custom and practice of the church of Rome, our church doth here set down this article, that those public services should be administered in a language understood by the people; and that the contrary is repugnant to the word of God and the practice of the primitive church.

First, that it is repugnant to the word of God is plain; for that commands that *all things be done to edifying*, 1 Cor. xiv. 26: and [e] what edifying can there be when the people know not what is said? Nay, the apostle, as if he foreknew what wild practices and opinions would arise in the church, spends almost a whole chapter in shewing that public duties should not be performed in an unknown tongue; *For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not to men, but God; for no man understandeth him*, 1 Cor. xiv. 2. *For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful*, ver. 14. *Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving*

---

[d] Jubemus omnes episcopos et presbyteros non in secreto sed cum ea voce quæ a fidelissimo populo exaudiatur divinam oblationem et precationem quæ fit in sancto baptismate facere, ut inde audientium animi in majorem devotionem et Dei laudationem et benedictionem efferantur, &c. Idcirco igitur convenit ut ea precatio, quæ in sancta oblatione dicitur, et aliæ orationes clara voce a sanctissimis episcopis et presbyteris proferantur Domino nostro Jesu Christo Deo nostro cum Patre et Spiritu S. Justinian. novel. 137. [p. 225.]

[e] Ex hac Pauli doctrina habetur, quod melius ad ecclesiæ ædificationem est, orationes publicas, quæ audiente populo dicuntur, dici lingua communi clericis et populo, quam dici Latine. Cajet. in 1 Cor. xiv. [p. 158.]

of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? ver. 16. *I thank my God I speak with tongues more than ye all; yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue*, ver. 18, 19. Certainly our adversaries are not of Paul's mind, who had rather speak ten thousand words in an unknown tongue, (as to the people,) than five words in a known.

And again, *If the church come together in one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned and unbelievers, will not they say that ye are mad?* ver. 23. Yes, certainly, any one that comes to the popish masses, and hears a sound, but understandeth not a word of what is said, will surely think them to be mad, mad people that go to pray to the eternal God, and yet know not what is said. And this doth not only make for public prayers, but for all public services whatsoever; and the sacraments amongst the rest, which our Saviour, and his apostles after him, administered in a known tongue. But we have a generation now sprung up that think themselves wiser than their Maker and Redeemer, and know better what language his sacraments are to be administered in than himself did.

But I wish they would at the length consider, whether all such services as are performed in an unknown tongue are not blind performances. The apostle said, *I will pray with my spirit, and I will pray with my understanding also*, 1 Cor. xiv. 15. And God's service should be *a reasonable service*, Rom. xii. 1. And therefore there is no [f] language scarce in the world but the scriptures are translated into it, that so all that profess the Christian religion, be they of what language they will, may know the mind and will of God, and understand the duties he requireth of them; and so perform a reasonable service to him. But, if there be no necessity of understanding what the priests say or do in their public services, surely the time spent in such translations was but vainly spent. But I would know further, how, if I understand not what is said, I shall know whether the priest prays for me or against me? Yea, how shall I know whether he prays or swears? Or whether he blesseth the bread or curseth it? Whether he desires God to pardon or to punish me? to save or to damn me? Certainly, he may do the one as well as the other, for aught that I know, unless I understand the language he speaks in.

---

[f] Καὶ ἡ Ἑβραίων φωνὴ, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὴν Ἑλλήνων μετεβλήθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων, καὶ Αἰγυπτίων, καὶ Περσῶν, καὶ Ἰνδῶν, καὶ Ἀρμενίων, καὶ Σκυθῶν, καὶ Σαυροματῶν, καὶ συλλήβδην εἰπεῖν, εἰς πᾶσας τὰς γλώττας, αἷς ἅπαντα τὰ ἔθνη κεχρημένα διατελεῖ. Theodor. de cur. Græc. affect. l. 5. [vol. IV. p. 555.]

Neither is this vain practice only repugnant to the holy scriptures and right reason, but to the primitive church also. Justin Martyr saith in his time, [g] "After this we rise all unanimously, and send up our prayers; and as we said before, our prayers being finished, the bread, and water, and wine is offered, and the president pours out prayers and thanksgivings as he is able, and then the people cry out, saying Amen." Now, if the people did not understand what was said, how, as the apostle saith, *could they say Amen?* And therefore Aventinus records of Methodius Illyricus, [h] "That he forced the Dalmatians and other Illyrians, that the Latin tongue being abolished, they should use the vulgar tongue in the celebration of the holy mysteries." And hence it was also, that in the primitive church their liturgies or common prayer books were still made in the language that was understood by them that were to use it; as St. Chrysostome, being himself a Grecian, composed his liturgy in the Greek language, and so St. Basil too. To which we may also add, besides that ascribed to St. James, the liturgies of St. Mark and St. Peter; all which were composed in a known language understood of the people. And in all of them there are still some things to be said by the people, which it would be impossible they should know when to say, unless they understood what went before: nay, and what is observable also, there are many things in these liturgies which the priest is expressly commanded to say [i] with a loud voice; and why so, but that the people might be sure to hear and understand them? And thus Origen saith, [k] "The Greeks pray to God in the Greek, the Romans in the Roman, and every one in his own tongue."

---

[g] *Ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν, καὶ ὡς προέφημεν, παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς ἄρτος προσφέρεται, καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ, λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν.* Justin. apol. [I. 67.]

[h] Quod impulerit Dalmatas aliosque Illyricos, ut, abolita lingua Latina, vulgari in sacris mysteriis peragendis uterentur. Avent. in annal. [p. 334.]

But this is so plain, "that," as Lyra saith, [l] "in the primitive church, the blessings, and other common prayers were made in the vulgar tongue," that the papists themselves, who are now the only persons that are against it, cannot but acknowledge it. For Aquinas himself saith, [m] "In the primitive church it was a madness for any one to say prayers in an unknown tongue, because then they were ignorant of the ecclesiastical rites, and knew not what was done there." So Harding too: [n] "In the time of the primitive church," says he, "the people celebrated holy things in the vulgar tongue." So that by their own confession, it is a thing repugnant to the custom of the primitive church to have public prayers or the sacraments administered in an unknown tongue.

---

[i] As, *'Εκφώνως ὁ ἱερεύς· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις.* Chrys. liturg. [Bibl. vet. patr. vol. II. p. 82.] *'Ο διάκονος ἐκφώνως· ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.* Ibid. [p. 65.] *'Ο ἱερεὺς κλίνει τὴν κεφαλὴν, καὶ αἰρὼν τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ μετὰ εὐλαβείας, εὐλογεῖ τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον, ἐκφώνως λέγων, ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς.* Basil. liturg. 3. [Ibid. p. 51.] *Λέγων ἐκφώνως, λάβετε, φάγετε.* Petri liturg. [Ibid. p. 120.] *Εἰπὼν ἐκφώνως, λάβετε, φάγετε,* &c. Marc. liturg. [Ibid. p. 37.] But I need not cite any more testimonies for this; for any one, that will but cast his eye into any of these ancient liturgies, will often meet with *ἐκφώνως*, or *λαμπρᾷ φωνῇ*, or something equivalent to them.

[k] *Οἱ Ἕλληνες Ἑλληνιστικῶς, οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι Ῥωμαϊκῶς, καὶ οὕτως ἕκαστος κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διάλεκτον εὔχεται τῷ Θεῷ.* Orig. contra Cels. l. 8. [37.] V. Jus G. Rom. p. 365.

[l] In primitiva ecclesia benedictiones et cætera communia fiebant in vulgari. Lyra in 1 Cor. xiv. [17.]

[m] In primitiva ecclesia insaniam fuisse, si quis ignota lingua preces dixisset, quia tunc fuerint rudes in ritu ecclesiastico, nescientes quæ fierent ibi. Aquin. in 1 Cor. 14. [vid. vol. XVI. fol. 84.]

[n] Tempore primitivæ ecclesiæ populus in lingua vulgari sacra celebrabat. Harding. art. 3. sect. [28.]

ARTICLE XXV.

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

HAVING seen what language it is that the sacraments are to be administered in, we have here determined what be those sacraments which are to be administered in such a language. That they are signs, it is here acknowledged; but that they are no more than signs, is the thing that is here denied. They be indeed such signs whereby a Christian is distinguished from a heathen; but that is not all they are; for besides that, they be also *sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace and God's will toward us, by which he works invisibly in us*, and confirms our faith graciously in himself, as we read how circumcision was the seal of the righteousness by faith, Rom. iv. 11. And what circumcision was to the Jews, other sacraments are to the Christians; not bare signs, but sure seals of the righteousness by faith, whereby God doth not only signify his grace to us, but confirms our faith in it; and our faith being confirmed in the sacraments, the sacraments do thereby prove so advantageous to our souls. So that the apostle saith, *For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ*, Gal. iii. 27. Such as apply to themselves by faith what is sealed in the sacraments by God, are made partakers of Christ, and all the benefits of his death and passion; and the sacraments being themselves a means whereby this our faith is confirmed in God, and God's love is confirmed to us, they must needs be more than bare tokens, and marks of distinction betwixt Christians and other men; yea, no less than sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, whereby God is pleased to work grace in us, and to enable us better to act faith in him.

And that the sacraments are not mere tokens or badges, but effectual signs and means of grace, we may read it frequently asserted by the Fathers: [a] "The baptism of Christians," saith Optatus, "made in the name of the Trinity, conferreth grace." [b] "Afterwards," saith Justin Martyr, "they are brought to the place where water is, and they are regenerated after the same manner of regeneration that we are regenerated withal." [c] "And we in the water are made partakers of the forgiveness of our sins before committed." And in the Constantinopolitan Creed itself it is said, [d] "We confess one baptism for the remission of sins." Nay St. Gregory saith, [e] "He that saith that sins in baptism are not wholly forgiven, may as well say that the Egyptians were not truly dead in the Red Sea." And St. Augustine also cried out, [f] "Whence comes there so much virtue into the water that it should touch the body and wash the heart?" "Why," as Gregory Nyssen saith, [g] "the water itself doth not afford that virtue, for of itself it is the weakest of all creatures; but the institution of God and the coming of the Holy Ghost, mystically working our liberty: but the water serves for the signification of that purging." But the principal thing to be considered in this article is what follows.

---

[a] Baptisma Christianorum Trinitate confectum confert gratiam. Optat. l. 5. [p. 98.]

[b] *Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀναγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται.* Just. apol. [I. 61.]

[c] *Ἀφέσεώς τε ἁμαρτιῶν ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν τύχωμεν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι.* Ibid.

[d] *Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.* Symb. Constant. [Conc. Hard. vol. I. p. 814.]

[e] Qui dicit peccata in baptismate funditus non dimitti, dicat in mari Rubro Ægyptios non veraciter mortuos. Gregor. l. [XL.] epist. [45. vol. II.]

[f] Unde tanta virtus aquæ ut corpus tangat, cor abluat? Aug. in Johan. tract. 80. [3. vol. III. par. ii.]

[g] *Ταύτην δὲ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν οὐ τὸ ὕδωρ χαρίζεται, ἣν γὰρ ἁπάσης τῆς κτίσεως ὑψηλότερον· ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ πρόσταγμα, καὶ ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις, μυστικῶς ἐρχομένου πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐλευθερίαν· ὕδωρ δὲ ὑπηρετεῖ πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς καθάρσεως.* Greg. Nyssen. orat. in bapt. Christi. [vol. III. p. 369.]

There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as are grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the scriptures; but yet have not the like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

Lombard [h] saying, that Baptism, Confirmation, the Blessing of Bread, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, are sacraments of the New Testament, the papists have thence gathered, and ever since held, that there are seven sacraments instituted by Christ, truly and properly so called: insomuch that in the council of Trent they determined, [i] that whosoever said there were more or less should be accursed. Now our church, not much fearing their curse, hath here declared, that only two of them, to wit, Baptism and the Eucharist, are properly sacraments of the New Testament, and that the other five are not to be accounted so: not but that, as the word sacrament was anciently used for any [k] sacred sign or ceremony, it may in some sense be applied to these also; but, as it is here expressed, those five have not the like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper. They may call them sacraments if they please, but they are not such sacraments as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are, and therefore not sacraments properly so called. For that these two are sacraments properly so called is acknowledged on both sides; and therefore whatsoever is a sacrament properly so called must have the like nature with them, so as to agree with them in all those things wherein their sacramental nature consisteth, that is, in such things wherein they two most nearly agree with one another: for that wherein the species do most nearly agree with one another must needs be their generical nature. Now there are several things wherein these two do so agree: for they are both instituted by Christ; they have both external signs and symbols determined in the gospel, which represent inward and spiritual grace unto us; yea, and they have both promises annexed to them. Whereas the other five agree with these in none of these things, or howsoever, none of them agree in all of them, and by consequence cannot be sacraments properly so called.

---

[h] Ad sacramenta novæ legis accedamus, quæ sunt baptismus, confirmatio, panis benedictus, id est eucharistia, pœnitentia, extrema unctio, ordo, conjugium. Lomb. l. 4. dist. 2. V. Allat. de consens. 1256, &c.

[i] Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet baptismum, confirmationem, eucharistiam, pœnitentiam, extremam unctionem, ordinem et matrimonium, aut etiam aliquid horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum, anathema sit. Concil. Trident. sess. 7. can. 1. [Hard. vol. X. p. 52.]

[k] Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum est. Aug. de civ. Dei, l. 10. c. 5. [vol. VII.] Signa cum ad res divinas pertinent sacramenta appellantur. Id. epist. [138. vol. II.]

First, they do not agree with them in their institution from Christ. That Baptism and the Lord's Supper were instituted by Christ, they cannot deny; but that the other were, we do. As, first, for Confirmation, which we confess was a custom anciently used in the Church of Christ, and still ought to be retained, even for children after Baptism to be offered to the bishop, that they might receive the Holy Ghost by prayers, and the laying on of hands. But [1]some of the papists themselves acknowledge, that this was never instituted and ordained by Christ as the other sacraments were; neither did the Fathers use this as any distinct sacrament, but as the [m] perfection and consummation of the sacrament of baptism; and the [n] chrism or ointment which they used was only a ceremony annexed to baptism also, as the cross and other ceremonies were.

---

[1] As Alexander Alensis and Bonaventura; the first holding, Quod confirmatio nec a Christo, nec ab apostolis, sed per concilium Meldense sit instituta. p. 4. [quæst. 9.] memb. 1. The other, that chrisma propterea oportere prius sanctificari, quia Christus illud non instituerit et virtute donaverit, sicut baptismum. Bonav. sent. l. 4. dist. 7. q. 2. V. et Biel. sent. 4. dist. 7. [p. 157.]

And as for penance, which they define to be a sacrament of the remission of sins which are committed after baptism, I would willingly know where or when Christ ever instituted such a sacrament. What though he commanded all men to repent, is every command of Christ an institution of a sacrament? Or is it outward penance that is here commanded? or rather, is it not inward and true repentance? And what though Christ said, *Those sins that you forgive they are forgiven;* what matter, what form, what signs of a sacrament were appointed and instituted in those words? And so for orders, or the ordination of ministers, I know it is a thing instituted by Christ; must it needs be therefore a sacrament?

---

[m] Nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in ecclesia baptizantur per præpositos ecclesiæ offerantur, et per nostram orationem et manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur, et signaculo dominico consummentur. Cyprian. epist. 73. [p. 202.] Peregre navigantes, aut si ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem (qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit bigamus) baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum catechumenum, ita ut si supervixerit, ad episcopum eum perducat, ut per manus impositionem perfici possit. Concil. Eliber. can. [38. vol. I. p. 254.] Quod si ab hæreticis baptizatum quempiam fuisse constiterit, erga hunc nullatenus sacramentum regenerationis iteretur, sed hoc tantum quod ibi defuit conferatur, ut per episcopalem manus impositionem virtutem Spiritus S. consequatur. Leo. epist. 37. V. et concil. Arel. 1. can. 8. And thus we read of Novatus, how being baptized when sick, *οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔτυχε, διαφυγὼν τὴν νόσον, ὧν χρὴ μεταλαμβάνειν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας κανόνα, τοῦ δὴ σφραγισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.* Euseb. hist. l. 6. c. [43. vol. I. p. 275.], which word Ruffinus translates, Nec reliqua in eo quæ baptismum sequi solent solenniter adimpleta sunt, nec signaculo chrismatis consummatus est.

[n] Unguentum effusum nomen tibi. Si magis etiam mystice vis intelligere, sacri baptismatis mysterium recordare, in quo qui initiantur post Satanæ abnegationem, et Dei confessionem, veluti signo ac nota regia spiritalis unguenti chrismate inuncti, sub ea visibili unguenti specie invisibilem sanctissimi Spiritus gratiam suscipiunt. Theodoret. in Cant. c. 1. [vol. I. p. 1002.] *Τὸ ἔλαιον βαπτίσματι παραλαμβάνεται μηνύον τὴν χρίσιν ἡμῶν καὶ χριστοὺς ἡμᾶς ἐργαζόμενον.* Damascen. thes. [orthod. vid.] l. 4. c. 10. *Ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ πάθους καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τελοῦμεν τὰ σύμβολα, πῶς πρῶτον μὲν ἐλαίῳ χριόμεθα, ἔπειτα δὲ τὰ προλεχθέντα ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ τελέσαντες σύμβολα τῷ μύρῳ σφραγιζόμεθα ὕστερον.* Quæst. et resp. ad orthod. ascript. Justino Mart. quæst. 137. [p. 501.]

or instituted as a sacrament? Because Christ ordained that bishops, priests, and deacons should be ordained, doth it therefore follow that he intended and instituted their ordination as a sacrament? And as for matrimony, I know their corrupt translation hath it, *And this is a great sacrament*, Eph. v. 32, instead of *This is a great mystery* or secret, [o] as the Syriac and Arabic read it; and shall their false translation of the scripture be a sufficient [ground] for Christ's institution of a sacrament? And lastly, for extreme unction, which Bellarmine tells us [p] "is truly and properly a sacrament, wherein the organs of the senses, the eyes, nostrils, lips, hands, feet, and reins in those that are about to die, are anointed with exorcised oil;" what institution have we for this sacrament in the gospel? Yes, say they, the apostles *anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them*, Mark vi. 13. It is very good; it seems the apostles' practice and example was the institution of a sacrament. By this rule, whatsoever the apostles did must be a sacrament; and so plucking of the ears of corn must be a sacrament too at length. But certainly if examples may be the ground of institution, anointing the eyes of the blind with clay and spittle must be much more a sacrament than the anointing of the sick with oil; for it was the apostles only that did this, but it was our Saviour himself that did that, John ix. 6. But the apostle saith, *If any one be sick amongst you, let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord*, James v. 14. It is true; but what analogy is there betwixt this anointing of the apostle and the extreme unction of the papists? This was to be applied to any that were sick, *Is any one sick amongst you?* but theirs only to such as are past [q] all hope of recovery; the apostles' was to be done by several elders, the papists' only by one priest; the apostles' was to be performed with simple oil, the papists' with consecrated and exorcised oil. So that the papists' extreme unction cannot possibly lay claim to any institution from that place, as Cajetan[r] himself acknowledged.

---

[o] Τὸ *μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν.* Syriac, ܗܢܐ ܐܪܙܐ ܪܒ ܗܘ Hoc arcanum magnum est. Arab. هذا السر لعظيم هو Hoc secretum magnum est; not, Hoc sacramentum magnum est.

[p] Est vere et proprie sacramentum, &c. in quo organa sensuum, oculi, nares, labia, manus, pedes, et renes oleo exorcizato in morituris inunguntur. Bellarm. de sacram. extremæ unctionis, c. 1.

[q] Unctionem extremam non esse adhibendam, nisi illis qui tam graviter ægrotant, ut de vita periclitentur. Ibid. c. 9.

And as for external signs and symbols analogically representing inward spiritual grace, which constitute the very form indeed of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, it is in vain to look for the like in the other sacraments, falsely so called, as is observed in the article. For as for example, what is the sign in penance? Or if there be a sign, what is the grace that is analogically represented by it? I know they cannot agree among themselves what is the form or sign in this sacrament. Some say the words of absolution, others absolution itself, others imposition of hands; but whichsoever of these we take, they cannot be such signs and symbols as are in Baptism and the Lord's Supper. For there is water, and bread, and wine, all substances; whereas these are all actions and accidents. The like may be said also of confirmation and orders, which have no such visible sign, howsoever not appointed by Christ. And so for matrimony too. There is no such sign of any invisible grace can possibly be fastened upon it. To say that the priest's words, or the party's mutual consent, is the form or sign, is a mere evasion: for the party's consent is an invisible thing, and therefore cannot be a visible sign; the words of the priest are mere words, which may be heard indeed, but cannot be seen, and so cannot be any visible sign. Neither are words significative elements, as bread and wine are, and therefore cannot be the signs of such sacraments as they be. And as for extreme unction, there is, I confess, an external sign in it, even unction; [s] but what analogy hath this external sign to any internal grace? Two things, they say, is (are?) represented by it, bodily health, and forgiveness of sins. But is bodily health an inward grace? or, suppose it was, what similitude is there betwixt that and oil, or unction? Forgiveness of sins, I know, is a spiritual grace; but none of them durst ever yet undertake to shew the analogy betwixt the visible sign and this invisible grace. And seeing there is no analogy betwixt the oil and remission of sins, that cannot be looked upon as any sacramental sign or symbol, as water and wine is (are?) in the other sacraments, exactly representing the inward spiritual grace that it signified by them. To all which we might add also, that it is of the nature of a sacrament to have promises annexed to them, promises of spiritual things. And what promises do we find in scripture made to matrimony, confirmation, to orders, and the rest?

---

[r] Nec ex his verbis, nec ex effectu colligi potest, quod hæc verba loquantur de sacramentali unctione extrema, sed magis de unctione quam instituit Dominus Jesus in evangelio, a discipulis exercendam in ægrotis. Textus enim non dicit, Infirmatur quis ad mortem, sed absolute, Infirmatur quis? Et effectum dicit infirmi alleviationem, et de remissione peccatorum non nisi conditionaliter loquitur; cum extrema unctio non nisi prope articulum mortis detur, et directe, ut ejus forma sonat, tendit ad remissionem peccatorum. Præter hoc quod Jacobus ad unum ægrotum multos presbyteros tum orantes tum unguentes mandat vocari, quod ab extremæ unctionis ritu alienum est. Cajetan. in Jac. 5. [p. 419.]

But whatsoever other things the papists would obtrude upon us as sacraments, it is certain that we find our Saviour solemnly instituting two and but two sacraments in the New Testament, to wit, those here mentioned, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. And therefore, when the apostle compares the law with the gospel, he instanceth in these two sacraments only, and none else; *And were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat;* 1 Cor. x. 2, 3. And he again joins these two together, saying, *For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit*, chap. xii. 13. And thus do the Fathers observe, how when one of the soldiers pierced our Saviour's side, and there came out blood and water, John xix. 34, [t] the two sacraments of the New Testament are thereby intimated to us.

---

[s] Si sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Aug. epist. [98. 9. vol. II.]

[t] Percussum est enim latus ejus, ut evangelium loquitur, et statim manavit sanguis et aqua, quæ sunt ecclesiæ gemina sacramenta; aqua in qua est sponsa purificata, sanguis ex quo invenitur esse dotata. Aug. de symb. ad catech. [15. vol. VI. p. 562.] Dormit Adam, ut fiat Eva, moritur Christus, ut fiat ecclesia;

And if we look into the Fathers, we shall find them, when speaking of the sacraments of the New Testament, still mentioning neither fewer nor more than two, even Baptism and the Lord's Supper. As St. Augustine: [u] "At this time, after that the judgment of our liberty was made most manifest by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, neither were we burdened with the heavy performance of those signs which we now understand; but the Lord himself and the apostolical doctrine delivered instead of many but some few things, and those most easy to be performed, most noble to be understood, and most chaste in their observation, such as are the sacrament of baptism, and the celebration of the body and blood of the Lord." And so St. Chrysostom: [x] "If," saith he, "no one can enter into the kingdom of heaven unless he be born again of water and the Spirit; and he that doth not eat the flesh of the Lord, nor drink his blood, is cast out of eternal life, &c." Where we see they mention these two sacraments, but not a word of penance, not a word of orders, not a word of any of the rest. So Fulbertus Carnotensis: [y] "There are three things requisite to the proficiency of

---

dormienti Adæ fit Eva de latere, mortuo Christo lancea percutitur latus, ut profluant sacramenta quibus formatur ecclesia. Id. in Joh. tract. 9. [10. vol. III. par. ii.] De latere in cruce pendentis lancea percusso sacramenta ecclesiæ profluxerunt. Ibid. tract. 15. [8.] Ἐξῆλθε δὴ γὰρ ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα· οὐχ ἁπλῶς, οὐδὲ ὡς ἔτυχεν, αὗται ἐξῆλθον αἱ πηγαί· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τούτων ἡ ἐκκλησία συνέστηκε· καὶ ἴσασιν οἱ μυσταγωγούμενοι, δι' ὕδατος μὲν ἀναγεννώμενοι, δι' αἵματος δὲ καὶ σαρκὸς τρεφόμενοι· ἐντεῦθεν ἀρχὴν λαμβάνει τὰ μυστήρια, ἵν', ὅταν προσίῃς τῷ φρικτῷ ποτηρίῳ, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῆς πίνων τῆς πλευρᾶς, οὕτω προσίῃς. [pp. 914, 915. vol. II.] Chrysost. in Joh. hom. 85. Ut Moses virga percutiens petram produxit fontem viventis aquæ, sic Christus mortem crucis degustans sanguinem et aquam produxit de latere suo, quibus duobus sacramentis sancta induitur ecclesia. Rab. Maur. de sacrament. euchar. c. 9.

[u] Hoc tempore postquam resurrectione Domini nostri Jesu Christi manifestissimum judicium nostræ libertatis illuxit, nec eorum quidem signorum quæ jam intelligimus operatione gravi onerati sumus, sed quædam pauca pro multis, eademque et factu facillima et intellectu augustissima, et observatione castissima, ipse Dominus et apostolica tradidit disciplina, sicuti est baptismi sacramentum, et celebratio corporis et sanguinis Domini. Aug. de doctrina Christ. l. 3. [13. vol. III.]

[x] Εἰ γὰρ οὐ δύναταί τις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐὰν μὴ δι' ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος ἀναγεννηθῇ, καὶ ὁ μὴ τρώγων τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ πίνων, ἐκβέβληται τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς. Chrysost. de sacerdotio orat. 3. [p. 16. 39. vol. VI.]

[y] Tria sunt ad profectum Christianæ religionis proposita. Horum primum est intelligere et firmiter tenere mysterium Trinitatis, et unius veritatem Deitatis. Secundum

Christian religion: of which the first is, to understand and firmly to hold the mystery of the Trinity, and the verity of one Deity: the second, to know the reason or cause of the saving baptism: the third is, in what the two sacraments of life, the body and blood of the Lord, are contained." And Algerus, [z] "Christ conforms one body of Christ and the church by a double sacrament," not a sevenfold. And Paschasius saith, [a] "The sacraments of Christ in the church are baptism and chrism, as also the body and blood of the Lord." Where by *chrism* we must understand that ceremony, which, as we saw before, was used in the church at the administration of baptism. Thus do we see the ancients in their enumeration of sacraments still reckon upon no more than two. So that Rupertus Abbas Tuitiensis propounds the question; [b] "What," saith he, "and how many are the principal sacraments of our salvation?" And he answers, "Holy baptism, and the holy eucharist of his body and blood, the double gift of his Holy Spirit." As if he should have said in the words of this article, *There are two sacraments ordained of Christ in the gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.*

The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as the apostle St. Paul saith.

In this the latter part of this article are contained three

---

salutaris baptismi rationem nosse vel causam. Tertium in quo duo vitæ sacramenta, id est Dominici corporis et sanguinis continentur. Fulb. Carnot. epist. 1. [vol. XVIII. Max. Bibl. Patr.]

[z] Christus duplici sacramento conformat unum corpus Christi id est ecclesiæ. Alger. de sacram. altaris vel eucharistiæ, l. 1. c. 19. [vol. XXI. ibid.]

[a] Sunt autem sacramenta Christi in ecclesia baptismus et chrisma, corpus quoque Domini et sanguis. Paschas. de corp. et sang. Domini, c. [10.]

[b] Quæ ergo et quot sunt præcipua salutis nostræ sacramenta? sacrum baptisma, sancta corporis ejus et sanguinis eucharistia, geminum Spiritus Sancti datum. Rupert. abbas Tuit. de victor. verbi, l. 12. c. 11. [vol. II.]

things; first, that the sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or carried about, which, concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper especially, is repeated again in the XXVIIIth article. The second is, that such as worthily receive the sacraments, the sacraments have a wholesome effect or operation in them, of which I shall have occasion to speak when treating upon the sacraments particularly. The third is the words of the apostle Paul, *They that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation,* 1 Cor. xi. 29. But of this I shall speak also particularly, art. XXIX. and therefore need not insist upon any of them here.

ARTICLE XXVI.

OF THE UNWORTHINESS OF THE MINISTERS, WHICH HINDERS NOT THE EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENTS.

Although in the visible church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometime the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministering, both in hearing the word of God, and in the receiving of the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

THE visible church, as we have seen before, is a congregation of faithful men; yet all are not truly faithful men that are of this congregation; but the church whilst floating in the world is like Noah's ark, wherein there are both clean and unclean beasts; and like the floor our Saviour speaks of, wherein there is both wheat and chaff. So that though in the triumphant church above all are good and none bad, all saints and no sinners; yet the militant church below hath bad as well as good, sinners as well as saints in it. Neither are the people only, but the priests also, oftentimes tainted with sin, and rebels against that God whose ambassadors they are: not only such as the sacraments are administered to, but also such as administer the sacraments, are often defiled with sin, though consecrated unto Christ. Their office indeed is holy, but their persons are often sinful: their work is always a good and godly work; but their hearts are frequently evil and wicked hearts. But howsoever, as their persons are not the better for their office, so neither is their office any whit the worse for their persons. If their persons be sinful, it is not their office that can make them truly holy; and [a] seeing their office is truly holy, it is not their persons can make it sinful. So that the sacraments are still holy sacraments, though administered by unholy priests; as, though the sun shines upon dirt, yet the sun is not thereby dirty; so, though the sacraments be administered by sinners, the sacraments are not therefore sinful. And as the sacraments are not sinful in themselves, because administered by sinful persons, so neither are they ineffectual as to those they are administered to, by reason of their sin they are administered by; or, as the title of this article fitly words it, *The unworthiness of the ministers hinders not the effect of the sacraments.* It [b] is better indeed to have the sacraments administered by worthy than by unworthy ministers; but howsoever, the sacraments may be as effectual when administered by unworthy as by worthy ministers. So that the effect of the office is not at all diminished by the defects of the officers: neither is God's grace hindered from being conveyed to such as worthily receive the sacraments, because of the sinfulness of those persons they receive them from. But a man may receive the sacraments effectually from an unworthy as well as from a worthy minister: he may be profited by the word preached and the sacraments administered, though the one be administered and the other preached by wicked and unworthy persons: I mean, if they be rightly called to the work, if it be their office to preach the word and administer the sacraments, we may hear the one and receive the other effectually at their hands, notwithstanding any personal infirmities they may lie under, or be guilty of.

---

[a] Certus est enim sanctum esse sacramentum Christi, etiamsi per minus sanctum vel non sanctum hominem ministratum est. Aug. contra Crescon. gram. l. 4. [24. vol. IX.] An vero solis vel etiam lucernæ lux, cum per cœnosa diffunditur, nihil inde sordium contraxit, et baptismus Christi potest cujusquam sceleribus inquinari? Si enim ad ipsas res visibiles quibus sacramenta tractantur animum conferamus, quis nesciat eas esse corruptibiles? Si autem ad id quod per illas agitur, quis non videat non posse corrumpi, quamvis homines per quos agitur pro suis moribus vel præmia percipiant, vel pœnas luant? Id. de baptismo contra Donat. l. 3. [15. vol. IX.]

[b] Ac per hoc abluit Christus et per maculosam non sancte dantis, sed melius per mundam sancte dantis conscientiam. Dat fidem Christus et per ministrum malum, sed melius per bonum: fit Christus origo Christiani et per dispensatorem infidelem, sed melius per fidelem: Christianus radicem in Christo figit per colonum reprobum, sed melius per probum: potest Christus esse caput Christiani per Felicianum, sed melius per Primianum. Aug. contra Crescon. gram. l. 4. [23. vol. IX.] Nam et ego dico, melius per bonum ministrum quam per malum dispensari sacramenta divina. Ibid. [24.]

And the truth of this we have notably discovered in our Saviour's words to the Jews: [c] *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do: but do not ye after their works: for they say and do not.* Matt. xxiii. 2, 3. That the Scribes and Pharisees were unworthy ministers of God's word is clear, in that they said and did not; yet for all that they said and did not, the Jews were bound to do as they said: yea, our Saviour commands them to be attentive in hearing the word, though they were unworthy that delivered it. [d] He doth not immediately command that they should be deposed from preaching the word to the people, but that the people should be diligent in hearing the word from them; which is a plain demonstration that the word was not hindered by their ministry, but that for all the unworthiness of those that it was administered by, yet it might be effectual to those it was administered to. And thus we see in the Old Testament, God did not pick out only holy persons to administer his sacraments, and offer up the sacrifices, but he appointed a certain tribe, the tribe of Levi, to do it. Though otherwise they might be unworthy for so holy and great a work, yet if they were of the tribe of Levi, if it was their office to do it, the work itself was not made ineffectual by their personal infirmities. Nay, it is observable, that our Saviour also had one amongst his disciples that administered the sacrament of baptism, John iv. 2; I say even amongst them he had one that was unworthy to do it, even a very [e] Judas; yet, for all that, he suffered his sacrament to be administered by him, as well as by any of the rest, yea, though he knew him to be what he was.

---

[c] Parva itaque inter nos in hac re, aut fortasse nulla dissensio est. Nam et ego dico, melius per bonum ministrum quam per malum dispensari sacramenta divina. Verum hoc propter ipsum ministrum melius est, ut eis rebus quas ministrat vita et moribus congruat, non propter illum qui, etiamsi incurrerit in ministrum malum dispensantem veritatem, securitatem accipit a Domino suo monente ac dicente, *Quæ dicunt facite, quæ autem faciunt facere nolite, dicunt enim et non faciunt.* Ibid.

[d] Καὶ γὰρ διεφθαρμένους ὄντας οὐ κατάγει ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, ἐκείνοις μὲν πλέον τὸ κρίμα ἐργαζόμενος. τοῖς δὲ μαθητευομένοις οὐδεμίαν παραλιμπάνων παρακοῆς πρόφασιν. Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 72. [p. 452. vol. II.]

And if we look for the reason of this, we have it expressed in the article itself, *Even because they do it not in their own names, but Christ's.* It is not their own word they preach, but Christ's; nor their own sacraments they administer, but Christ's; and therefore, be their own sins what they will, the ordinance is still Christ's ordinance; the institution of it is from Christ; the promises annexed to it are made by Christ; and we cannot think that Christ's grace should be hindered by man's sin; or that because ministers are not faithful to Christ, Christ should not therefore be faithful to his people in performing his promises made to them; which promises were not made to the administration of the ordinance by faithful persons, but to the ordinances in general, as duly administered even by such as are truly and rightly called to it. So that the ordinance itself is never the better for being administered by worthy, nor is it the worse for being administered by unworthy persons. Whether the ministers be worthy or unworthy, it is still by the grace of Christ his ordinances are made effectual. If Christ be pleased to withhold his grace, be the minister never so worthy, it cannot be obtained; and if Christ be pleased to convey his grace, be the minister never so unworthy, it cannot be hindered. So that he that receives grace from an ordinance must not thank the minister for his worthiness, but Christ for his goodness: and he that receives no grace must not blame the unworthiness of the minister, but the faithlessness of his own heart. For be the minister worthy or unworthy, if I come with faith to an ordinance, I am sure to go with grace from it.

---

[e] Judas eligitur ut domesticum inimicum haberet Dominus, quia perfectus est, qui nequam familiarem non timet; et ideo ut doceret nos pati malos inter nos, et nullum nisi convictum abjicere; et ut ostenderet apostolatum non esse meritum, sed ministerium, tam bene operaretur per istum malum, sicut per et Petrum miracula et sacramenta. Anselm. enar. in [Matt.] 10.

And this is the doctrine which St. Augustine doth frequently inculcate, and stiffly maintain against the Donatists, and others of old. [e] "Remember," saith he, "that the manners of evil men do not hinder the sacraments of God, so as to make them either not to be at all, or less holy." And elsewhere: [f] "But the baptism of Christ consecrated with the words of the gospel is itself holy by adulterers and in adulterers, although they be immodest and unclean; for its holiness cannot be polluted, and the virtue of God is still present in the sacrament, either to the salvation of them that use it[g] well, or the destruction of such as use it[g] ill." And again: [h] "But if God be present at his sacrament and word by whomsoever they are administered, the sacraments of God are always right, and wicked men which are not profited by them are always perverse." And again: [i] "For it is no doubt but homicides may have baptism, which is the sacrament of the remission of sins, which are yet in the dark, &c. And whether it be delivered or received by such, it is not violated by their perverseness either within or without." And therefore saith he, [k] "Or who can say that baptism, because such have or give it, is polluted by their iniquities?" And again: [l]"But it matters not as to the integrity of baptism, how much the worse he is that delivers it; for there is not so much difference betwixt bad and worse, as there is betwixt good and bad; yet when a bad man baptizeth, he doth not give any other thing than a good one."

---

[e] Memento ergo sacramentis Dei nihil obesse mores malorum hominum, quo illa vel omnino non sint, vel minus sancta sint. Aug. contra literas Petiliani, l. 2. [110. vol. XI.]

[f] Baptismus vero Christi verbis evangelicis consecratus et per adulteros et in adulteris sanctus est, quamvis illi sint impudici et immundi; quia ipsa ejus sanctitas pollui non potest, et in sacramento suo divina virtus assistit, sive ad salutem bene utentium, sive ad perniciem male utentium. Id. de baptismo, contra Donat. l. 3. [15.]

[g] *them* MS.

[h] Si autem Deus adest sacramentis et verbis suis, per qualeslibet administrentur, et sacramenta Dei ubique recta sunt, et mali homines quibus nihil prosunt, ubique perversi sunt. Ibid. l. 5. [27.]

[i] Baptismum vero, quod est sacramentum remissionis peccatorum, quia nulli dubium est habere etiam homicidas posse, qui in tenebris sunt usque adhuc, &c., et sive tradatur sive accipiatur a talibus, nulla eorum perversitate violari, sive intus, sive foris. Ibid. [29.]

[k] Aut quis dicat baptismum Christi, quod tales haberent vel darent, eorum iniquitatibus fuisse violatum? Ibid. l. 6. [33.]

I shall add no more but that excellent passage in St. Chrysostom that speaks so fully to the purpose; [m]"But," saith he, "neither baptism, nor the body of Christ, nor the offering ought to be administered by such, if grace looked for worthiness every where. But now God is wont to work even by such as are unworthy, and the grace of baptism is not at all hindered by the life of the priest;" which is the sum and substance of this part of the Article, that the effect of the sacraments is not hindered by the unworthiness of the minister.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty by judgment, be deposed.

It being determined in the former part of the Article, that the unworthiness of the minister doth not hinder the effect of the sacraments, it is very opportunely added in this, that such unworthy ministers be inquired out, yea and proceeded against according to the discipline of the church. Though whilst unworthy they may administer the sacraments effectually, it doth not follow but that they should endeavour to be worthy ministers of them, and to practise that in themselves which they preach to others; yea, and if guilty of notorious and scandalous crimes, deposed from the ministry too. For *a bishop*, as the apostle saith, and so every other minister, *should be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach ; not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre ; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous*, 1 Tim. iii. 2, 3. Yea, *he must be a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate*, Tit. i. 8. Thus it is that a minister of God ought to behave himself. And truly there is all the reason in the world, that ministers of all the people in the earth, whose office it is to beat down sin in others, should not keep it up in their own hearts. For how can I reprove that sin in another which I allow in myself? *Thou*, saith the apostle, *which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?* Rom. ii. 21, 22. To which I may add, Thou that callest upon others to love God as the best of goods, and to hate sin as the worst of evils, what, wilt thou hate God as if he was the worst of evils, and love sin as if it was the best of goods? thou that preachest to others to leave the world and follow Christ, wilt thou leave Christ to follow the world? thou that preachest a man should desire God above all things, wilt thou desire all things before God? thou that criest to others *Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?* what, thou rather die than turn? thou that sayest covetousness is idolatry, and drunkenness bestiality, wilt thou fall down to the one, and be-beast thyself with the other? thou that shewest to others the way that leads from hell to heaven, wilt thou thyself go the way that leads from heaven to hell? thou that warnest others to beware of misery, and to labour after glory, wilt thou neglect that glory, and cast thyself headlong into misery? thou that holdest open the door to others, wilt thou shut it upon thyself? Certainly it is the greatest aggravation in the world that any sin can be invested withal, even to have it committed by one whose office and work it is to destroy it. [n] This is that which makes the least sin in ministers appear and be bigger than the greatest in the people. Their moats are beams in comparison of others'; and others' beams are but moats in comparison of theirs. Others may sin themselves, and only themselves sin; but if a minister sins, others commonly sin with him; [o] he cannot fall but he draws many after him. For when the people see one lying in sin himself, that tells men they must not sin, they presently think he is not in earnest when he speaks of God, or grace, or sin, or glory; for did he really believe all he saith concerning these and the like things, he could not but walk more answerably to them than he doth: and thus his lying in one sin is the occasion of others falling into many.

---

[l] Sed nihil interest ad integritatem baptismi quanto pejor id tradat: neque enim tantum interest inter malum et pejorem, quantum interest inter bonum et malum; et tamen cum baptizat malus nihil aliud dat quam bonus. Ibid. [43.]

[m] *Καὶ οὐκ ἔμελλεν οὐδὲ βάπτισμα εἶναι, οὔτε σῶμα Χριστοῦ, οὔτε προσφορὰ δι᾽ ἐκείνων, εἰ πανταχοῦ τὴν ἀξίαν ἡ χάρις ἐζήτει· νυνὶ δὲ καὶ δι᾽ ἀναξίων ἐνεργεῖν ὁ Θεὸς εἴωθε, καὶ οὐδὲν τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἡ χάρις παρὰ τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἱερέως παραβλάπτεται.* Chrysost. in 1 Cor. hom. 8. [p. 290. 42. vol. III.]

---

[n] Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν, οὐκ ἐστὶ τὰ τῶν ἱερέων κρύπτεσθαι ἐλαττώματα· ἀλλὰ καὶ μικρότατα ταχέως κατάδηλα γίνεται. Chrysost. de sacerdotio, l. 3. [p. 22, 3. vol. VI.] Οἱ δὲ ἐν τῇ κορυφῇ ταύτης καθήμενοι τῆς τιμῆς,

And hence it is that the church of God hath in all ages inquired after evil ministers, and hath deposed such from the ministry that have not walked worthy of it. It would be an endless thing to recite the many canons that have been made both by œcumenical and provincial councils, for the suspending, excommunicating, and deposing of sinful and loose ministers. I shall instance but in some few. The Elibertine council decreed, [p] "That bishops, priests, and deacons, if, being placed in the ministry, they be discovered that they have committed adultery, for the scandalous and atrocious crime, even to the end, they ought not to receive communion." Nay, the fifth council at Carthage was so severe against the scandalous sins of ministers, that they determined, [q] "That if a clergyman of what degree soever is condemned for any crime by the judgment of the bishops, it may not be lawful

---

πρῶτον μὲν πᾶσίν εἰσι κατάδηλοι· ἔπειτα κἂν ἐν τοῖς μικροτάτοις σφαλῶσι, μεγάλα τὰ μικρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις φαίνεται. Οὐ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ γεγονότος μεγέθει, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ διαμαρτόντος ἀξίᾳ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν μετροῦσιν ἅπαντες. Ibid. [19.]

[o] *Τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν τυχόντων ἁμαρτήματα, ὥσπερ ἔν τινι σκότῳ πραττόμενα, τοὺς ἐργαζομένους ἀπώλεσε μόνους· ἀνδρὸς δὲ ἐπιφανοῦς καὶ πολλοῖς γνωρίμου πλημμέλεια κοινὴν ἅπασι φέρει βλάβην.* Ibid. [14.]

[p] Episcopi, presbyteri, et diaconi, si, in ministerio positi, detecti fuerint quod sint mœchati, placuit ut, propter scandalum et propter nefandum crimen, nec in fine eos communionem accipere debere. Concil. Elibert. can. [19. Concil. vol. I.]

[q] Et illud statuendum, ut, si quis cujuslibet honoris clericus judicio episcoporum pro quocunque crimine fuerit damnatus, non liceat eum sive ab ecclesiis quibus præfuit, sive a quolibet homine defensari, interposita pœna damni pecuniæ atque honoris, quo nec ætatem nec sexum excusandum præcipimus. Concil. Carthag. quint. can. 2. [Ibid. p. 987.]

for him to be defended, either by the church he was placed over, or by any man whatsoever, the punishment of the loss of money and honour being interposed, from which we command that neither age nor sex be excused."

The fourth council at Carthage made many canons also against evil ministers; amongst the rest, [r]" Every clergyman that is a slanderer or reviler, especially amongst the priests, let him be forced to beg pardon; if he will not, let him be degraded, neither let him be ever called again to his office without satisfaction:" and, " That [s]a scurrilous clergyman, and one that jesteth with obscene words, should be deposed from his office:" and, " A clergyman [t]that swears by the creatures must be sharply reproved, and if he still continue in his sin, excommunicated."

At a council at Agatha it was also decreed, that [u]" before all things drunkenness should be avoided by the clergy, which is the fomenter and nurse of all vices; therefore any one that appears to have been drunk, (as order suffers,) we appoint that he be either removed from communion for the space of thirty days, or else undergo bodily punishment." And it was one of the canons of the third council at Orleance, [x]" If any clergyman commits any theft or falsity, because they also are capital crimes, communion being granted him, let him be deposed or degraded from his degree. But concerning perjury, we thought good it should be observed, that if any clergyman in such causes that are to be ended by an oath, shall swear, and afterwards by evident testimony shall be discovered to have sworn falsely, let him be driven from communion for the space of two years." I shall conclude with that comprehensive canon of the first council of Orleance; [y] "If a deacon or a presbyter shall commit a capital crime, let him be driven both from his office and communion." So then our church was not the first that determined that evil ministers should be deposed, it being no more than what others before have done.

---

[r] Clericus maledicus, maxime in sacerdotibus, cogatur ad postulandum veniam. Si noluerit degradetur, nec usque ad officium absque satisfactione revocetur. Concil. Carthag. quart. can. 57. [Ibid. p. 982.]

[s] Clericum scurrilem et verbis turpibus joculatorem ab officio detrudendum. Ibid. c. 60.

[t] Clericum per creaturas jurantem acerrime objurgandum, si perstiterit in vitio excommunicandum. Ibid. can. 61.

[u] Ante omnia clericis vitetur ebrietas, quæ omnium vitiorum fomes et nutrix est. Itaque eum, quem ebrium fuisse constiterit, ut ordo patitur, aut triginta dierum spatio communione statuimus submovendum, aut corporali subdendum supplicio. Concil. Agath. c. 41. [vol. II.]

[x] Si quis clericus furtum aut falsitatem admiserit, quia capitalia etiam ipsa sunt crimina, communione concessa ab ordine degradetur. De perjurio autem id censuimus observandum, ut si quis clericus in causis quæ sub jurejurando finiendæ sunt præbuerit juramenta, et post rebus evidentibus detegitur pejerasse, biennii tempore a communione pellatur. Concil. Aurel. tert. c. 8. [Ibid.]

---

[y] Si diaconus aut presbyter crimen capitale commiserit, simul ab officio et a communione pellatur. Concil. Aurel. prim. c. [9. Ibid.]

ARTICLE XXVII.

OF BAPTISM.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

AS it was by circumcision that the Jews were distinguished from all other people in the world, so is it by baptism that Christians are distinguished both from Jews and others: for all that are baptized are Christians, and none are Christians but such as be baptized. And so baptism is a mark of difference whereby Christians are discerned from such as are not christened. But though this be one effect of baptism, it is not all. For it is not only a sign of our profession, but also of our regeneration, and therefore it is called *the washing of regeneration*, Tit. iii. 5. So that by it we are grafted into the church, and made members of that body whereof Christ is the head; for *we are baptized into one body*, 1 Cor. xii. 13, and have a promise from God of the forgiveness of those sins we have committed against him. And therefore Peter said unto them, *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins*, Acts ii. 38; that so, *being justified by his grace, we should be made* (not only sons but) *heirs according to the hope of eternal* *life*, Tit. iii. 5. And so in baptism our faith is confirmed, and grace increased; not by virtue of the water itself, but by virtue of prayer, whereby God is prevailed with to purify our souls by his Spirit, as our bodies are washed with the water: that as the water washeth off the pollutions of our bodies, so his Spirit purgeth away the corruptions of our souls.

But all these things will be made more clear and firm by the testimonies of the Fathers; and therefore I shall immediately pass on to them.

And truly, if we consult the Fathers in this case, they will unanimously tell us, that we are not only distinguished from others, but regenerated by God in baptism; yea, that in baptism our sins are pardoned to us, and our corruptions subdued under us. Thus Origen: [z] "Thou descendedst into the water dead in sin; thou ascendedst quickened in righteousness." And presently: "And [a] because by the sacrament of baptism the filth of our nativity is purged away." St. Chrysostom saith, "[b] But our circumcision, I mean the grace of baptism, hath cure without pain, and brings us innumerable good things, and fills us with the grace of the Holy Spirit, and hath not a set time as it was there under the law; but it is lawful for any man in his infancy, middle age, or old age, to receive this circumcision made without hands, wherein we do not undergo labour, but lay aside the burden of our sins, and find the forgiveness of our faults committed at all times." For, as the same Father elsewhere, [c] "As the body of Christ being buried in the earth brought forth the [d] fruit, even the salvation of the world, so also our body being buried in baptism brought forth fruit, even righteousness, sanctification, adoption, and innumerable other good things." St. Augustine saith, [e] "That renovation in baptism is made in a moment, by the forgiveness of sins; for there is not so much as one, be it never so small, that remains, but may be pardoned." Yea, St. Gregory saith, [f] "He that saith sins are not quite forgiven in baptism, may as well say the Egyptians were not truly dead in the Red sea." And St. Augustine again, [g] "That in the baptismal washing, not only the pardon of such sins as are committed, but of such as shall be afterwards committed, is granted to such as believe in Christ." And presently, [h] "It is so, I say, to be taken, that by the same washing of regeneration, and the word of sanctification, all the sins of regenerate men are cleansed and healed, not only the sins which are now pardoned in baptism already, but also those which afterwards by human ignorance or frailty shall be contracted." And the council of Nice, [i] "He that is baptized descends indeed obnoxious to sins, and held with the corruption of slavery, but he ascends free from that slavery and sins, the son of God, heir, yea, co-heir with Christ, having put on Christ, as it is written, *If ye be baptized into Christ, ye have put on Christ.*"

---

[z] Mortuus in peccatis descendisti, et ascendis vivificatus in justitia. Origen. in Luc. 2. hom. 14.

[a] Et quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur. Ibid. [vol. III. p. 948.]

[b] Ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα περιτομὴ, ἡ τοῦ βαπτίσματος λέγω χάρις, ἀνώδυνον ἔχει τὴν ἰατρείαν, καὶ μυρίων ἀγαθῶν πρόξενος γίνεται ἡμῖν, καὶ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ἡμᾶς ἐμπίπλησι χάριτος, καὶ οὐδὲ ὡρισμένον ἔχει καιρὸν, καθάπερ ἐκεῖ, ἀλλ' ἔξεστι καὶ ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικίᾳ, καὶ ἐν μέσῃ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ γήρᾳ γενόμενόν τινα, ταύτην δέξασθαι τὴν ἀχειροποιητὸν περιτομὴν, ἐν ᾗ οὐκ ἔστι πόνον ὑπομεῖναι, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτημάτων φορτία ἀποθέσθαι, καὶ τῶν ἐν πάντι χρόνῳ πλημμελημάτων τὴν συγχώρησιν εὑρέσθαι. Chrysost. in Gen. hom. 40. [p. 328. 4. vol. I.]

[c] Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ταφὲν ἐν τῇ γῇ καρπὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης τὴν σωτηρίαν ἤνεγκεν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἡμέτερον ταφὲν ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι καρπὸν ἤνεγκε τὴν δικαιοσύνην, τὸν ἁγιασμὸν, τὴν υἱοθεσίαν, τὰ μυρία ἀγαθά. Id. in Rom. hom. 11. [p. 79. 25. vol. III.]

[d] MS. *fruits*, and a little below, *bodies* and *bring* for *body* and *brought*.

But because it is here said that baptism is the sign of regeneration, and the word *regenerated* is so much carped at in our order for the administration of baptism, I shall next shew how the primitive church did long ago not only hold the same assertion, but also use the same expression. So saith St. Chrysostome, [k] "By water we are regenerated, by blood and flesh we are nourished." Athanasius, [l] "He that is baptized puts off the old man, and is renewed, as being regenerated by the grace of the Spirit." [m] "And so," saith St. Basil, "being baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, we are regenerated." The second council at Milevi or Milenum, [n] "Infants, who cannot commit any sin as yet of themselves, are therefore truly baptized into the remission of sins, that what they contracted by generation might be cleansed in them by regeneration." To name no more, Justin Martyr himself, long before any of these, said expressly; [o] "Afterwards they be brought by us to a place where there is water, and after the same manner of regeneration that we are regenerated by, are they also regenerated." And therefore let such as carp at that word in our liturgy hereafter know, it is the primitive church itself, and the most ancient and renowned Fathers they carp at.

---

[e] Sicut in momento uno fit illa in baptismo renovatio remissione omnium peccatorum; neque enim vel unum quantulumcunque remanet quod non remittatur. Aug. de Trinit. l. 14. [23. vol. VIII.]

[f] Qui dicit peccata in baptismate funditus non dimitti, dicat in mari rubro Ægyptios non veraciter mortuos. Greg. epist. l. [xi. ep. 45. vol. II.]

[g] Quod baptismali lavacro non solum patratorum, verum etiam posteriorum peccatorum venia Christi fidelibus impetretur. Aug. de nuptiis et concupis. ad Val. l. 1. [38. vol. X.]

[h] Sic inquam accipiendum est, ut eodem lavacro regenerationis et verbo sanctificationis omnia prorsus mala hominum regeneratorum mundentur atque sanentur, non solum peccata quæ omnia nunc remittuntur in baptismo, sed etiam quæ posterius humana ignorantia vel infirmitate contrahuntur. Ibid.

[i] Descendit quidem is qui baptizatur peccatis obnoxius et servitutis corruptione detentus; ascendit autem ab ea servitute et peccatis liber, factus filius Dei, et hæres, gratia ipsius factus, cohæres autem Christi, indutus ipsum Christum sicut scriptum est, *Quicunque in Christum baptizati estis Christum induistis.* Concil. Nic. de S. baptismo apud Gelas. Cyzicen. l. 3. c. 31. [p. 173.]

But we must know withal, that though the ancient Fathers do give so much as we do to baptism, yet not so much as the papists do. For they say baptism itself doth all these things for us; whereas what the Fathers still averred was, that it is the grace and Spirit of God in baptism that doth them. For, saith St. Basil, [p] "If there be any grace in the water, it is not from the nature of the water, but from the presence of the Spirit." [q] "For remission of sins," saith St. Cyprian, "whether it be given by baptism or other sacraments, it is properly from the Holy Ghost; for it is to him only the privilege of this work belongs." [r]"And the water," saith Cyril of Hierusalem, "purges the body, but it is the Spirit that signs the soul." And presently, [s]"When therefore thou art descending into the water, do not look upon the bare water, but lay hold upon salvation by the working of the Holy Ghost." [t]"But this benefit," saith Gregory Nyssen, "the water itself doth not afford us, for it is the weakest of all creatures; but the command of God, and the coming of the Holy Ghost, coming mystically to our redemption." And to name no more, St. Augustine, [u]"The water of the sacrament," saith he, "is visible, but the water of the Spirit is invisible; that washeth the body, and signifieth what is done in the soul; by the Spirit the soul itself is cleansed and fatted." So that it is not to the water itself, but to the Spirit in the water we are to ascribe these glorious effects; and therefore it is here said, that in baptism *faith is confirmed, and grace increased by prayer to God.* We must pray for God's presence in the sacrament; for without that we can receive no blessing from it; but with that there is no blessing but we may have in it.

---

[k] *Δι᾽ ὕδατος μὲν ἀναγεννώμενοι, δι᾽ αἵματος δὲ καὶ σαρκὸς τρεφόμενοι.* Chrysost. in Joh. hom. 85. [p. 915. 1. vol. II.]

[l] *Ὁ δὲ βαπτιζόμενος τὸν μὲν παλαιὸν ἀπεκδιδύσκεται, ἀνακαινίζεται δὲ ὡς ἄνωθεν γεννηθεὶς τῇ τοῦ πνεύματος χάριτι.* Athan. in illud, Quicunque dixerit, &c. [vol. I. p. 705.]

[m] *Καὶ οὕτως ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος βαπτισθέντες ἄνωθεν ἐγεννήθημεν.* Basil. de baptismo, l. 1. c. 3. [p. 579. vol. I.]

[n] Parvuli, qui nihil peccatorum in semetipsis adhuc committere potuerunt, ideo in remissionem peccatorum veraciter baptizantur, ut in eis regeneratione mundetur, quod generatione contraxerunt. Concil. Milevit. 2. c. 2. [Hard. concil. vol. I. p. 927.]

[o] *Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται.* Justin. Martyr. apol. [I. 61.]

[p] *Ὥστε εἰ τὶς ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι χάρις, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς φύσεώς ἐστι τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος παρουσίας.* Basil. de Spiritu S. c. 15. [p. 323. vol. II.]

[q] Remissio peccatorum sive per

The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

Ever since it pleased God to enter into covenant with man, he hath been pleased also to seal that covenant to him by sacraments, outwardly representing what was spiritually pro-

---

baptismum, sive per alia sacramenta donetur, proprie Spiritus Sancti est, et ipsi soli hujus efficientiæ privilegium manet. Cyprian. de baptis. Christi, [p. 30. ad calc. Cypr. oper.]

[r] Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ καθαίρει τὸ σῶμα, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα σφραγίζει τὴν ψυχήν. Cyril. Hier. catech. 3. [2.]

[s] Μέλλων τοίνυν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ καταβαίνειν, μὴ τῷ ψιλῷ τοῦ ὕδατος πρόσεχε, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐνεργείᾳ τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐνδέχου. Ibid.

[t] Ταύτην δὲ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν οὐ τὸ ὕδωρ χαρίζεται, ἣν γὰρ ἂν πάσης τῆς κτίσεως ὑψηλότερον· ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ πρόσταγμα, καὶ ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις, μυστικῶς ἐρχομένου, πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν. Greg. Nyssen. orat. de baptismo Christi, [vol. III. p. 369.]

[u] Aqua sacramenti visibilis est, aqua Spiritus invisibilis; ista abluit corpus, et significat quod fit in anima; per illum Spiritum ipsa anima mundatur et saginatur. Aug. in epist. Joh. tract. 6. [11. vol. III. par. ii.]

mised. The covenant of works had a double sacrament annexed to it, the tree of life, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. And the covenant of grace, according to the various dispensations of it, it hath had various sacraments also annexed to it. Under the law, or the more imperfect expressures of the said covenant, the sacraments were circumcision and the passover; under the gospel, or the more perfect expressures of it, they be baptism and the Lord's supper. Which several sacraments, though they do differ in several things, yet as in other things, so in this they agree, that both under the law and gospel still one of them is an initiating, and the other a confirming sacrament. And so these of the gospel do exactly answer those under the law, not only in being instituted by the same Lord, and representing the same grace, but also in entitling us to the actual enjoyment of covenant privileges, and then in confirming the same privileges to us. By circumcision then, and baptism now, are we made members of the church of God; and by the Lord's supper now, as by the paschal lamb then, the benefits of church-membership are sealed and confirmed to us. And the evangelical thus coming into the place of the legal sacraments, the same persons that were to participate of the legal are to participate also of the evangelical.

Now under the law it is plain, that not only proselytes, but the children of Jewish parents, even of eight days old, were to be circumcised; that is, by circumcision were to be [w] initiated into the church of God; and so God commanding children to be circumcised, or initiated into the church, the same command may well be looked upon as reaching to baptism too; for it is by this we are initiated into the church now, as it was by circumcision they were initiated then. So that whosoever doth not baptize his children [x] whilst children seems to me to transgress the command of God, in not initiating them into the church according to his precepts.

---

[w] That by circumcision children were initiated into the church, and brought as it were into the covenant, the Jews themselves acknowledge and observe, as we may note from what is said at the circumcision of a child. The father saith, בא״י אמ״ה אקב״ו להכניסו בבריתו של אברהם אבינו, i. e. "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, who hast sanctified us with thy precepts, and commanded us to initiate him (this child) into the covenant of Abraham our father." And then the people that stand by say, כשם שהכנסתו לברית כן תכניסהו לתורה ולחופה ולמעשים טובים, "As thou hast initiated or brought him into the covenant, so bring him to the law, to matrimony, and to good works." V. Buxt. synag. Jud. c. [4. p. 99.]

For though circumcision be only mentioned, yet it was therefore mentioned because the initiating sacrament whereby children were invested with church-membership; and the same reason holds good still for baptism. And as where the reason of a law fails, the law itself is abrogated, so where the reason of a law remains, the law seems still to be in force, though some circumstances of it be changed.

But I would not be thought to speak this as if I supposed there was no law commanding infant-baptism in the New Testament, but only that for infant-circumcision in the Old; for questionless the words of our Saviour are a law, when he saith, *Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, Matt. xxviii. 19. Where, though it be translated *teach*, yet the word in the original properly imports [y] *disciple*, and *make*

---

[x] Contra anabaptistas leg. can. apost. 47. [Bever. synod. vol. I.] Carthag. 51, 52. [Ibid. p. 573.]

[y] To find out that this is the true purport and meaning of the word, the best way will be to compare the places where it occurs, as Matt. xiii. 52. *Διὰ τοῦ τοπᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*, where the Syriac renders the word *μαθητευθεὶς* by ܕܡܬܬܠܡܕ, "dmethtalmad," *qui discipulus factus est, qui discipulum se præbet*, it being the passive of ܬܠܡܕ, *to make a disciple*, from the Hebrew word תלמיד, *a scholar, a disciple*, 1 Par. xxv. 8: and it doth not only signify a scholar or learner, but a follower and professor of such a doctrine or tenet, in which sense תלמידיא is oft used in the Targum, as Num. xxxii. 14, Onk. and likewise in the Talmud, Berach. [fol.] 43. 2. And in this sense doth our Saviour always call his disciples ܬܠܡܝ̈ܕܐ, "talmide," and so the Syriac word ܬܠܡܕ, "talmed," *to disciple*, comes from ܬܠܡܝܕܐ, "talmido," as the Greek *μαθητεύω* from *μαθητὴς*, (whence we may also observe, that the very notation of the word doth properly denote, *to disciple*, and not, *to teach*,) and this is the sense and the only sense which the Syriac word bears wheresoever it comes, and that not only in the scripture, but other authors, as ܐܬܬܠܡܕܘ ܠܗ ܠܣܒܪܬܐ, "ethtalmad loh lasbartô," Offic. Maron. p. 394, i. e. *are become professors* or *disciples of the gospel*. And thus also is it taken in the place before cited, Matt. xiii. 52. The Arabic also, not only following the same sense, but using the same word too, even يتلمذ, "yattalmido," *is made a disciple*: and so the Persic renders it by شاكرد, "shakird," *a disciple*. And indeed the scope of the place cannot admit of any other interpretation of the

disciples; as if he should have said, Go ye and disciple all nations, or bring them over to be my disciples, and baptize them. So that all that are disciples are here commanded to be baptized; nay, they are therefore commanded to be baptized because disciples. And seeing all disciples are to be baptized, infants, the children of believing parents, amongst the rest, must be baptized too; for that they are disciples is clear, from their being circumcised under the law: for that argued they were in covenant with God, otherwise they could not have had the seal of the covenant administered to them; and if they were in covenant with God, they must needs be disciples; to be a disciple, and to be in covenant with God, being one and the same thing. So that all that are in covenant with God are his disciples; and all that are his disciples are in covenant with him. And again, of children our Saviour saith, *Of such is the kingdom of God,* Mark x. 14. And therefore they must needs be disciples, unless such as are not disciples should be thought to belong unto the kingdom of God. But I need not insist any longer upon this, to prove little

word there. Another place where it comes is Matt. xxvii. 57, *ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθήτευσε τῷ Ἰησοῦ,* that is, as the Syriac hath it, ܕܐܦ ܗܘ ܐܬܬܠܡܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܝܫܘܥ, "doph hu ethtalmad vaw lejeshuah," *who also was himself a disciple of Jesus,* or, *because he also was discipled to Jesus.* And so both the Arabic and Persic likewise; which the Ethiopic explains ወወእቱሂ፡ ተፀምደ፡ "wawatuhi tazamdo," for he also followed *the Lord Jesus as a disciple.* The third place where the word occurs is Acts xiv. 21, *καὶ μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανοὺς,* that is, as the Syriac renders it, ܘܬܠܡܕܘ ܗܘܘ ܠܣܓܝܐܐ, "talmed vaw lesagiye," *and had made many disciples;* and so the Arabic renders it too by وتلمذا, "watalmada," *and they discipled many,* as the words both in the Syriac and Arabic imply; though they be translated in both very improperly, *Et docuerunt multos,* (where we may see what little use the Latin translations are of if we have not skill in the languages themselves.) But the Ethiopic not having one word to express the full meaning of the place by, it puts another to it; for immediately after it saith ወመሀሩ፡ "wamaharu," *and they taught,* it adds, ወአብኡ፡ "waabu," *and they brought in,* viz., to the church; shewing that it was not a bare teaching which the original word implied, but such a teaching as brought many into the church, and made them disciples of Christ. And these are all the places in the New Testament (the text under hand, Matt. xxviii. 19. excepted) wherein the Greek *μαθητεύω,* the Syriac ܬܠܡܕ, "talmed," and the Arabic تلمذ, "talmada," are used, always answering one another. Only the children to be disciples, if their parents be. For so long as children they are looked upon as parts of their parents, and therefore what their parents are they must needs be: if their parents be heathens, the children are heathens; if their parents be Christians, the children are Christians too. And truly unless this be granted, the children of believing parents under the gospel will be brought into a worse condition than they were under the law; for under the law children were still acknowledged to be within the covenant, and therefore had always the seal of the covenant administered to them: and if the children of believing parents, I mean outward professors of faith, should be denied the same privilege now under the gospel, the gospel must be necessarily supposed to be more strait and narrow than the law itself. But seeing both law and gospel contain one and the same covenant, and seeing under the law children were accounted disciples, and therefore circumcised as well as adult proselytes, it must needs follow, that children are in the same capacity still as they were then; and seeing they were then admitted into the church by circumcision, they are now to be invested with the same privilege by baptism.

Syriac ܐܬܬܠܡܕ, "ethtalmad," is used Luke i. 4, and ܡܬܬܠܡܕ, "methtalmad," Acts xviii. 25, both answering to the Greek *κατηχέομαι*, which also doth not signify a bare teaching, but such a teaching as one learneth by, and becomes a professor of. And the word thus signifying not to teach, but disciple, and make disciples, in all other places, it would be strange if it did not denote the same here too, viz., Matt. xxviii. 19. I am sure the Syriac (in which this commission for baptizing was first given to the disciples, our Saviour speaking that in Syriac which St. Matthew afterwards wrote in Greek) and Arabic translate it by the selfsame words here that they do in the other places, the Syriac by ܬܠܡܕܘ, "talmed," and the Arabic by تلمذوا, "talmidu," *make disciples;* and it is observable that neither of them use the same word for *διδάσκοντες* in the next verse, but the one ܐܠܦܘ ܐܢܘܢ, "alleph enun," the other علموهم, "alimuhom," *teach them:* only the Ethiopic renders both by መሀሩ፡ but that is because they have no one word that signifies such a kind of teaching as *μαθητεύω* doth, and therefore we may well understand here what the same translation adds to express the full meaning of the word by Acts xiv. 20, as the Persic also doth, "Ite ac totum mundum docete ودر ايمان وباوري من بباوريد et ad fidem et religionem meam reducite." And thus we see how all the ancient translations agree in the expounding of the word *μαθητεύω* in this as well as other places, not teach, but disciple: and therefore cannot but wonder how any one can brand that exposition with novelty.

Only we shall take notice of the doctrine and practice of the primitive church in this particular; and surely the nearer to the fountain head, the clearer the streams. Whether the apostles baptized children or no is nowhere expressly delivered in scripture; but howsoever it may be gathered from their successors: for certainly the apostles' successors durst never have done it unless they had seen the apostles themselves doing it before them.

Now Origen saith, [z] "Young children are baptized into the remission of sins." And presently, [a] "And because that by the sacrament of baptism the filth of our nativity is laid aside, therefore are little children baptized." And elsewhere, [b] "To this may that also be added, that it should be inquired into what is the cause, that seeing baptism is given to the church for the remission of sins, according to the observance or custom of the church, baptism is given also to little children; whereas if there was nothing in little children that ought to belong to pardon and forgiveness, the grace of baptism would be superfluous."

In St. Cyprian's time there were some that thought indeed that children ought not to be baptized till the eighth day, according to the time appointed for circumcision; but none that held they ought not to be baptized at all whilst children. And to one that supposed they ought not to be baptized till the eighth day, St. Cyprian writes, saying, [c] "But as to the cause of infants, which thou sayest before the second or third day after they are born ought not to be baptized, and that the law of the ancient circumcision is to be observed, that thou shouldst think that any one that is born ought not to be baptized or sanctified before the eighth day, it seemed far otherwise to all in our council; for in this which thou thoughtest should be done, none agreed; but rather all of us judged that the mercy and grace of God (in baptism) should be denied to no one born of men." So that it seems a whole council then determined that children ought to be baptized.

---

[z] Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum. Origen. in Luc. hom. 14. [p. 948. vol. III.]

[a] Et quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur baptizantur et parvuli. Ibid.

[b] Addi his etiam illud potest ut requiratur, quid causæ sit, cum baptisma ecclesiæ in remissionem peccatorum detur, secundum ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari, cum utique si nihil esset in parvulis quod ad remissionem deberet et indulgentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur. Id. in Lev. hom. 8. [3. vol. II.]

[c] Quantum vero ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti intra secundum vel tertium diem quo nati sunt constitutos baptizari non oportere, et considerandam legem esse circumcisionis antiquæ, ut intra octavum diem eum qui natus est baptizandum et sanctificandum non putares, longe aliud in concilio nostro omnibus visum est. In hoc enim quod tu putabas esse faciendum nemo consensit, sed universi potius judicavimus nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandam. Cyprian. epist. l. 3. [ep. 64. init.]

St. Augustine spends a whole chapter in proving, [d] "That by the price of the blood of Christ in baptism, children are washed, freed, and saved from original sin propagated from the first parents." And elsewhere he saith plainly, [e] "Seeing therefore children do not begin to be of the sheep of Christ but only by baptism, truly if they do not receive that, they will perish."

But to leave private persons, and to come to councils. The second council at Milevum determined, saying, [f] "It pleaseth also that whosoever shall deny that children newly come from their mothers' wombs should be baptized, let him be accursed." And the council at Gerundia, [g] "Concerning infants which are lately brought forth from their mother's womb, it pleaseth that it should be appointed, that if they be infirm, (as usually they are,) and do not desire their mother's milk, if they be offered, they may be baptized even the same day they are born." Yea, and the sixth general council, called the Trullan, saith, [h] "We, following the canonical constitutions of the

---

[d] Quod pretio sanguinis Christi in baptismo abluuntur parvuli, liberantur et salvantur a peccato originali a primis propagato parentibus. Aug. contra Jul. Pelag. l. 3. c. 3.

[e] Quoniam ergo de ovibus ejus non incipiunt esse parvuli nisi per baptismum, profecto si hoc non accipiunt, peribunt. Id. de peccat. merit. et remis. l. 1. [40. vol. X.]

[f] Item placuit ut quicunque parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, &c. anathema sit. Concil. Milevit. 2. can. 2. [Concil. Hard. vol. I. p. 1217.]

[g] De parvulis qui nuper a materno utero editi sunt, placuit constitui, ut si infirmi (ut assolet) fuerint, et lac maternum non appetunt, etiam eadem die qua nati sunt, si oblati fuerint, baptizentur. Concil. Gerund. can. 5. [Concil. Hard. vol. II. p. 1044.]

[h] Τοῖς *κανονικοῖς τῶν πατέρων θεσμοῖς κατακολουθοῦντες ὁρίζομεν καὶ περὶ τῶν νηπίων, ὁσάκις μὴ εὑρίσκονται βέβαιοι μάρτυρες, οἳ ταῦτα ἀναμφιβόλως βαπτισθέντα εἶναι λέγοντες, καὶ οὐδὲ ταῦτα διὰ τὴν κεῖραν περὶ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς μυσταγωγίας ἀποκρίνεσθαι ἐπιτηδείως ἔχουσιν, χωρὶς τινὸς προσκόμματος ὀφείλειν ταῦτα βαπτίζεσθαι.* Concil. Trul. can. 84. [vol. III. p. 1692.]

Fathers, determine also concerning infants, that as often as there shall not be found sufficient witnesses which will say that they were undoubtedly baptized, and themselves, by reason of their infancy, cannot aptly answer for the mysteries being delivered to them, without any scandal such ought to be baptized." So that it is not only the opinion of private persons, or particular synods, but of a general council itself, that *the baptism of infants ought in any wise to be retained in the church.*

ARTICLE XXVIII.

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

OF the two sacraments which it hath pleased our Lord Christ to institute in his church, the first, viz., baptism, we have discoursed of in the foregoing article: the other presents itself to be spoken to in this under the name of the supper of the Lord. Which name, though the papists are very angry at us for making use of it, yet we need not regard that, seeing the scripture giveth us sufficient warrant for it, St. Paul himself calling it the *Lord's supper*, 1 Cor. xi. 20. And therefore though the Fathers do often call it the eucharist, as we may see art. XXIV., yet do they frequently call it the Lord's supper also, as we may see in the margin[a]. And there is good reason for the name too; for seeing it was instituted at eventide, yea, at supper-time, it may well be called a supper; and seeing it was instituted by the Lord himself, it may well be called the Lord's supper.

---

[a] *Ἐξ ὧν παιδευόμεθα, μητὲ τὸ κοινὸν δεῖπνον ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, μητὲ τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον ἐν οἰκίᾳ καθυβρίζειν.* Basil. reg. brevior. interrog. 310. [vol. II.] *Ὅτι τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, τουτέστι τὸ δεσποτικὸν, ὀφείλει κοινὸν εἶναι.* Chrysost. in 1 Cor. hom. 27. [p. 419. 23. vol. III.] *Καὶ τράπεζαν παραθεὶς αἰσθητὴν, πρὸς ἐκείνην τὴν τράπεζαν τὸν νοῦν ἀνάτεινον, πρὸς τὸ δεῖπνον τὸ κυριακόν.* Ibid. [p. 422. 36.] Dominicam cœnam vocat sacramentum Dominicum. Theodoret. in 1 Cor. 11. [20. vol. III.] Hanc ipsam acceptionem eucha-

This sacrament of the Lord's supper is here said not only to be a sign of the love Christians ought to have to one another, but a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that to such as receive it by faith, *the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ;* which being the very words of the apostle, 1 Cor. x. 16, I need not heap up any more scriptures to prove it. For though our translation reads *communion* instead of *partaking*, yet they both come to one and the same thing; and therefore is it often translated *partaking* too as well as *communion.* To this therefore I shall only add the express words of institution, wherein Christ said of the bread, *This is my body*, Matt. xxvi. 26, and of the wine, *This is my blood of the new testament, shed for many for the remission of sins*, ver. 28. And if the bread be his body and the wine his blood, it must needs follow, that whosoever eats the one and drinks the other as he ought to do, is made partaker of the body and blood of Christ.

The Fathers are very frequent in asserting this truth; I shall instance but in a few. St. Cyril of Jerusalem; [b] "With all certainty or persuasion let us partake of it as of the body and blood of Christ; for under the type of bread his body is given to thee, and under the type of wine his blood is given to thee; that partaking of the body and blood of Christ, thou mayest be of one body and blood with him." So that we so partake of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, as

---

ristiæ Dominicam cœnam vocans. Aug. epist. [LIV. 7. vol. II.] Quapropter neminem cogimus Dominica illa cœna prandere, sed nulli etiam contradicere audemus. Ibid. [9.] Quis ad convivium illud Dominicum quod infamant sine sua suspicione dimittet? Tertul. de uxore, l. 2. c. 4. [vol. III.] *Κυριακὸν δὲ δεῖπνον τὸ δεσποτικὸν καλεῖ μυστήριον.* Œcum. in 1 Cor. 11. [vol. I. p. 529.] V. et Nilum in parænet. c. [120. vol. VII. Max. Bibl. patr. p. 1149.] et Hesych. l. 7. in Levit. c. 24.

[b] *Μετὰ πάσης πληροφορίας ὡς σώματος καὶ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνωμεν Χριστοῦ· ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτου δίδοταί σοι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου δίδοταί σοι τὸ αἷμα, ἵνα γένῃ, μεταλαβὼν σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ, σύσσωμος καὶ σύναιμος αὐτοῦ.* Cyril. Hier. catech. myst. 4. [1.]

that we are thereby made one body and blood with himself. Therefore saith St. Hilary, [c] "Of the truth of the flesh and blood there is no place left to doubt; for now by the profession of the Lord himself it is truly flesh and truly blood; and these being received and taken down, cause that we should be in Christ, and Christ in us." And St. Chrysostome; [d] "Wherefore it is necessary we should learn the miracle of these mysteries, what it is, and why it was given, and what profit there is of the thing. We are made one body, and members of his flesh and of his bones. But let such as are initiated strive for the knowledge of these sayings: that therefore we may not only be made such by love and charity, but indeed mixed with that flesh. It is that nourishment that causeth it, which he hath vouchsafed us, willing to shew us the desire he hath towards us; therefore he mixed himself with us, and tempered his body with ours, that we might become one, as a body joined to the head." To which we may add that of St. Augustine; [e] "But let us hear and understand two in one flesh, Christ and the church, as the mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus giving us his flesh to be eaten, and his blood to be drunk, we receive with a faithful heart and mouth." Thus Origen saith, [f] "When thou receivest the holy food, and that incorruptible banquet, when thou enjoyest the bread and water of life, and eatest and drinkest the body and blood of the Lord, then doth the Lord come under thy roof." And Tertullian; [g] "The flesh is shadowed by imposition of hands, that the soul may be illuminated by the spirit. The flesh is fed with the body and blood of Christ, that the soul may be fattened by God." And Macarius; [h] "In the church is offered bread and wine, the antitype of his flesh and blood; and they that partake of the visible bread spiritually eat the flesh of the Lord." All which could not be, unless we were partakers of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament.

---

[c] De veritate carnis et sanguinis non est relictus ambigendi locus: nunc enim et ipsius Domini professione, et fide nostra vere caro est et vere sanguis est; et hæc accepta atque hausta id efficiunt, ut et nos in Christo et Christus in nobis sit. Hilar. de Trin. l. 8. [14.]

[d] *Διὸ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον μαθεῖν τὸ θαῦμα τῶν μυστηρίων τί ποτέ ἐστι, καὶ διὰ τί ἐδόθη, καὶ τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τοῦ πράγματος· ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν, καὶ μέλη ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ· οἱ δὲ μεμυημένοι παρακολουθείτωσαν τοῖς λεγομένοις· ἵν' οὖν μὴ μόνον κατὰ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦτο γενώμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα εἰς ἐκείνην ἀνακερασθῶμεν τὴν σάρκα· διὰ τῆς τροφῆς τοῦτο γίνεται ἧς ἐχαρίσατο, βουλόμενος ἡμῖν δεῖξαι τὸν πόθον ὃν ἔχει περὶ ἡμᾶς· διὰ τοῦτο ἀνέμιξεν ἑαυτὸν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀνέφυρε τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἕν τι γενώμεθα, καθάπερ σῶμα κεφαλῇ συνημμένον.* Chrysost. in Joh. *λογ. μϛ.* tom. 2. p. 746. [26.]

[e] Nos autem audiamus et intelligamus duos in carne una, Christum et ecclesiam, sicut Mediatorem Dei et hominum, hominem Christum Jesum, carnem suam nobis manducandam, bibendumque sanguinem dantem fideli corde atque ore suscipimus. Aug. contra advers. leg. et proph. l. 2. [33. vol. VIII.]

[f] Quando sanctum cibum illudque incorruptum accipis epulum, quando vitæ pane et poculo frueris, manducas et bibis corpus et sanguinem Domini, tunc Dominus sub tectum tuum ingreditur. Origen. in diversa evangel. loca, hom. 5. [p. 285. part. ii. opp. fol. *Par.* 1604.]

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord) cannot be proved by holy writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

Scripture and Fathers holding forth so clearly, that whosoever worthily receives the sacrament of the Lord's supper do[th] certainly partake of the body and blood of Christ, the devil thence took occasion to draw men into an opinion, that the bread which is used in that sacrament is the very body that was crucified upon the cross; and the wine, after consecration, the very blood that gushed out of his pierced side. The time when this opinion was first broached was in the days of Gregory the Third, pope of Rome. The persons that were the principal abettors of it were Damascen [i] in the eastern, and afterwards Amalarius[k] in the western churches. It was no sooner started in the east, but it was opposed by a famous council at Constantinople, consisting of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, the famous opposers of idol-worship. But afterwards in the second council of Nice it was again defended, and in particular by Epiphanius the deacon, who confidently affirmed, that [l] "after the consecration, the bread and wine are called, are, and believed to be properly the body and blood of Christ." In the western also, Amalarius having broached this opinion, Paschasius Radbertus glibly swallowed it down. But Rabanus Maurus, Ratramnus or Bertramnus, (of whom more presently,) as also Johannes Scotus Erigena, not only stuck at it, but refused it, and wrote against it as a poisonous error. And after them Berengarius too, who was not only written against by Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, but condemned for it in a council held at [m] Vercel, (where the book of Johannes Scotus of the eucharist was also condemned,) and at another council held at Rome about the same time. And though he did recant his opinions at a council held at Tours, and another at Rome, [n] as some think, so as never to hold it more, [o] yet his followers would never recant what they had learned from him. But in the Lateran council, held an. 1215, the opinion of the real or carnal presence of Christ was not only confirmed, but the word

---

[g] Caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut et anima spiritu illuminetur. Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur. Tertul. de resurrect. carnis, c. 8. [vol. III.]

[h] Ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος, ἀντίτυπον τῆς σάρκος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος, καὶ οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἐκ τοῦ φαινομένου ἄρτου, πνευματικῶς τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίουσι. Macar. Ægypt. hom. 27. [17.]

[i] Οὐκ ἔστι τύπος ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου τεθεωμένον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου εἰπόντος, τοῦτό μού ἐστι, οὐ τύπος τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλὰ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ οὐ τύπος τοῦ αἵματος, ἀλλὰ τὸ αἷμα. Damascen. orthod. fid. l. 4. c. 14. [p. 317.]

---

[k] Hic credimus naturam simplicem panis et vini mixti verti in naturam rationabilem, scilicet corporis et sanguinis Christi. Amalar. de eccles. offic. l. [III.] c. 24.

[l] *Μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν σῶμα κυρίως καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ λέγονται, καὶ εἰσὶ, καὶ πιστεύονται.* Epiphan. diac. in conc. Nicen. ii. [act. 6. Conc. Hard. vol. IV. p. 372.]

[m] In qua (synodo Vercellensi) in audientia omnium, qui de diversis hujus mundi partibus illuc convenerant, Johannis Scoti liber de eucharistia lectus est ac damnatus: sententia tua Berengari exposita ac damnata. Lanfranc. contra Berengarium, [Petri *Μικροπρεσβυτικὸν*, p. 529.]

[n] I say, as some think. For others think the contrary; for so Bertold: Berengarius, novæ hæresis de corpore Domini auctor, eo tempore deficiens, abiit in locum suum: qui licet eandem hæresin sæpissime in synodo abjuravit, ad vomitum tamen suum canino more non expavit redire. Nam et in Romana synodo canonice convictus hæresin suam in libro a se descriptam combussit, et abjuratam anathematizavit, nec tamen postea dimisit. Bertold. presbyt. Constant. ad an. 1083. [p. 352. German. histor. illust. a C. Urstitio.]

[o] Berengarius plane quamvis ipse sententiam correxit omnes tamen quos ex totis terris depravaverat convertere nequivit. Malmesb. de gest. Angl. l. 3. [p. 114. Rer. Anglic. scriptt.]

transubstantiated was newly coined to express it by; that council determining, that [p] "there is one universal church of the faithful, without which there is none saved; in which Jesus Christ himself is both priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood in the sacrament of the altar are truly contained under the shapes of bread and wine; the bread being transubstantiated, or substantially changed into his body, and the wine into his blood, by the power of God; that for the perfecting the mystery of our union we might receive of him what he had received of us." And ever since this word was thus forged by this council, the abettors of this opinion have made use of it to declare their minds by concerning this great mystery; still holding with the council of Trent, [q] "That by the consecration of the bread and wine is made a change of the whole substance of bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which change is aptly and properly called by the holy catholic church transubstantiation." So that according to this opinion, the bread and wine, which before are properly bread and wine only, and not the body and blood of Christ, are after consecration as properly the body and blood of Christ only, and not bread and wine; the bread being changed by the words of consecration into the very body of Christ that hung upon the cross, and the wine into the very blood that ran in his veins, and afterwards issued forth out of his side.

Now the doctrine delivered in the former part of this article being so much abused, that they should take occasion from that great truth to fall into this desperate error, so as to say the bread and wine is really changed into the body and blood of Christ, because he doth really partake of the body and blood of Christ that rightly receives the bread and wine; that truth is no sooner delivered, but this error is presently opposed: it being no sooner declared that the bread we break is a partaking of the body, and the cup we bless a partaking of the blood of Christ, but it is immediately subjoined, that notwithstanding the truth of that assertion, yet transubstantiation, or the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, is to be rejected upon a fourfold account: first, because it cannot be proved by the scriptures; secondly, it is repugnant to them; thirdly, it overthroweth the nature of the sacrament; fourthly, it hath given occasion to many superstitions. Of which in their order briefly.

---

[p] Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur, in qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis, accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro. Concil. Lateran. 4. c. 1. [Concil. vol. VII.]

[q] Per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus, quæ conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta catholica ecclesia transubstantiatio est appellata. Concil. Trident. sess. 13. cap. 4. et can. 2. [Concil. vol. X.]

As for the first, that this doctrine of transubstantiation cannot be proved from the holy scriptures is plain from the insufficiency of those places which are usually and principally alleged to prove it; and they are the sixth of St. John's Gospel and the words of institution. In the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel we find our Saviour saying, *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed*, John vi. 55. And many such like expressions hath he there concerning our eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood. From whence they gather, that the bread and wine are really turned into the body and blood of Christ; not considering, first, that our Saviour said these words at the least a year before the sacrament of the Lord's supper was instituted; for when Christ said these words, it is said, that *the passover was nigh*, ver. 4; whereas the institution of the sacrament was not until the passover following: and it is very unlikely that he should preach of that sacrament before it was instituted. To which we may also add, that our Saviour here saith concerning the flesh and blood here spoken of, *Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, ver. 53. Whereas it is manifest, that a man may be deprived of the sacramental bread and wine, and yet have life in him; for otherwise all that die before they receive the sacrament must of necessity be damned. And therefore though the thing signified, even the flesh and blood of Christ, is here to be understood, yet the signs themselves of the sacrament cannot. And so this place not intending the bread and wine in the sacrament, it cannot be a sufficient foundation to ground the transubstantiation of that bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. And, secondly, suppose this place was to be understood of the sacrament, when our Saviour saith, *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;* this might prove that Christ's body and blood were turned into flesh and drink, but not at all that bread and drink are turned into his body and blood. Thirdly, it is plain that our Saviour in these words doth not mean any external or bodily, but an internal and [r] spiritual feeding upon him. So that whosoever thus feedeth upon him shall never die, ver. 50, but live for ever, ver. 51; yea, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him,* ver. 56. So that, as [s] Origen observeth, no wicked man can eat of this bread here spoken of; whereas it is as clear as the noonday sun, that sinners as well as saints, the worst as well as the best of men, may eat the bread and drink the wine in the sacrament. And as the sixth of St. John's Gospel doth not, so neither doth the words of institution, *This is my body,* prove the transubstantiation of the bread into the very body of Christ. For he that saith, because our Saviour said, *This is my body,* the bread is therefore changed into his body, may as well say, that because that Joseph said, *The seven good kine are seven years, and the seven good ears are seven years,* Gen. xli. 26, therefore the seven good kine and the seven good ears were all changed into seven years. And because that Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, *Thou art this head of gold*, Dan. ii. 38, therefore Nebuchadnezzar must needs be changed into an head of gold. Whereas it is plain that in scripture[t] that is often said to be a thing which is only the sign of it: as the great God is pleased to explain himself when he said of circumcision, *This is my covenant*, Gen. xvii. 10; and in the next verse, *And it shall be a sign or token of the covenant betwixt me and you*, ver. 11. And what sense the Most High explains himself by in that sacrament, we may well understand him in in this. When he said, *This is my covenant*, he tells us what he meant by the phrase, even, This is the sign of my covenant: and so here, when Christ said, *This is my body*, according to his own explication of himself before, it is no more than if he should have said, This is the sign or token of my body. And therefore saith St. Augustine, [u]"For if sacraments should not have a certain resemblance of the things whereof they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all; but from this resemblance they often receive the name of the things themselves. Therefore, as after a certain manner the sacrament of Christ's body is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of his blood is blood; so the sacrament of faith (baptism) is faith." So that the words, *This is my body*, prove no more than that the bread was the sign or sacrament of his body, not at all that it is really changed into his body. But that this doctrine of transubstantiation cannot be proved from the scriptures is further evident, in that it is contrary to them.

---

[r] Καὶ ἐνταῦθα γὰρ ἀμφότερα περὶ αὐτοῦ εἴρηκε, σάρκα καὶ πνεῦμα· καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα πρὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα διέστειλεν, ἵνα μὴ μόνον τὸ φαινόμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀόρατον αὐτοῦ πιστεύσαντες μάθωμεν, ὅτι καὶ ἃ λέγει οὐκ ἐστὶ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ πνευματικά. Athanas in illud. Quicunque dixerit, &c. [vol. I. p. 710.] Ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναβάσεως ἐμνημόνευσε τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα τῆς σωματικῆς ἐννοίας αὐτοὺς ἀφελκύσῃ, καὶ λοιπὸν τὴν εἰρημένην σάρκα βρῶσιν ἄνωθεν οὐράνιον καὶ πνευματικὴν τροφὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ διδομένην μάθωσιν. Ibid.

[s] Multa porro et de ipso verbo dici possunt, quod factum est caro verusque cibus, quem qui comederit omnino vivet in æternum, quem nullus malus potest edere. Etenim si fieri posset, ut qui malus adhuc perseverat, edat verbum factum carnem cum sit verbum et panis vivus, nequaquam scriptum fuisset, *Quisquis ederit panem hunc vivet in æternum.* Origen. in Mat. 15. [vol. III. p. 500.]

And that is the second thing here asserted of transubstantiation, that it is repugnant to the plain words of the holy scriptures. Which to prove I need go no further than to shew, that the scripture doth still assert them to be bread and wine after as well as before consecration. And this one might think was plain enough in the first place, even from the words of institution themselves: for the scripture saith, *And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body,* Matt. xxvi. 26. So that that which Jesus took was bread, that which Jesus blessed was bread, that which Jesus gave to the disciples was bread; and therefore that of which he said, *This is my body,* must needs be bread too, as the [x] Fathers long ago acknowledged. And truly in reason it cannot be denied; for there is no other antecedent to the pronoun *this,* but bread; for the body of Christ, that cometh after it, cannot possibly be the antecedent to it. For according to the principles of our adversaries themselves that hold this opinion, the bread is not changed into the body of Christ before consecrated, nor is it consecrated until the words, *This is my body,* be all pronounced; so that when the priest saith *This,* there is no such thing as the body of Christ present, that not coming in till both that and the following words too are perfectly uttered; and therefore the body of Christ can by no means be looked upon as the antecedent to this pronoun; but that it is bread, and bread only, that it hath reference to. So that *This is my body* is as much as to say,

---

[t] Solet autem res quæ significat ejus rei nomine quam significat nuncupari; sicut scriptum est, *Septem spicæ septem anni sunt, et septem boves septem anni sunt*, (non enim dixit septem annos significant,) et multa hujusmodi. Hinc est quod dictum est *Petra erat Christus*, non enim dixit Petra significat Christum, sed tanquam hoc esset, quod utique per substantiam non hoc erat sed per significationem. Aug. in Lev. q. 57. [3. vol. III. p. 516.]

[u] Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerunque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut enim secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est. Aug. epist. ad Bonifacium, [98. 9. vol. II.]

---

[x] *Αὐτοῦ οὖν ἀποφηναμένου καὶ εἰπόντος περὶ ἄρτου, τοῦτό μού ἐστι τὸ σῶμα, τίς τολμήσει ἀμφιβάλλειν λοιπόν;* Cyril. Hier. catech. myst. 4. init. *Ἐν δέ γε τῇ τῶν μυστηρίων παραδόσει σῶμα τὸν ἄρτον ἐκάλεσε, καὶ αἷμα τὸ κρᾶμα.* Theodoret. dialog. 1. [p. 17. vol. IV.] *Τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν.* Ibid. [p. 18.] Sic Deus in evangelio quoque vestro revelavit panem corpus suum appellans. Tertul. adv. Marcion. l. 3. c. 19. [vol. I.] Utique in corpus ejus lignum missum est; sic enim Christus revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans cujus retro corpus in pane prophetes figuravit. Id. adv. Judæos, [c. 10. vol. II.] Quando Dominus corpus suum panem vocat, de multorum granorum adunatione congestum, populum nostrum quem portabat indicat adunatum; et quando sanguinem suum vinum appellat de botris atque acinis plurimis expressum atque in unum coactum, gregem item nostrum significat commixtione adunatæ multitudinis copulatum. Cyprian. epist. [69. p. 182.] Nos autem audiamus panem quem fregit Dominus deditque discipulis suis esse corpus Domini salvatoris. Hieron. ad Hedibiam, [ep. cxx. 2. vol. I.] Sed et suis discipulis dans

This bread is my body; this bread that I have taken and blessed and give to you, is my body. Now, as Bellarmine[y] himself acknowledgeth, this proposition, *This is my body*, cannot possibly be taken any other ways than significatively, so as that the sense should be, This bread signifies my body, is a sign or sacrament of it, it being absolutely impossible that bread should be the very body of Christ: for if it be bread and yet the very body of Christ too, then bread and the body of Christ would be convertible terms. So that the very words of institution themselves are sufficient to convince any rational man, whose reason is not darkened by prejudice, that that of which our Saviour said, *This is my body*, was real bread, and so his body only in a figurative or sacramental sense; and by consequence, that the bread was not turned into his body, but his body was only represented by the bread. But if this will not do, we may consider in the second place the institution of the other part of the sacrament: for it is said, *And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins*, Matt. xxvi. 27, 28. Where these last words, *for this is my blood*, &c., being the words of consecration; and our Saviour having given them the cup before, and bidden them to drink all of it, it could not possibly be meant of any thing else than the wine in the cup, of which he said these words. To which we may also observe what follows, even after the words of consecration: *But I say*

---

consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura panis est accepit et gratias egit dicens, *Hoc est corpus meum;* et calicem similiter qui est ex ea creatura quæ est secundum nos suum sanguinem confessus est. Irenæus adv. hæres. l. 4. c. [17. 5.] *Εἰπὼν δὲ τοῦτο μού ἐστι τὸ σῶμα, δεικνύει ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐστὶν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἁγιαζόμενος ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, καὶ οὐχὶ ἀντίτυπον.* Theophyl. in Matt. 26. [p. 162.] And therefore in Dioscorus's Ethiopic Liturgy, in the rehearsal of our Saviour's words at the consecration of the bread and wine, for *τοῦτό μου ἐστι τὸ σῶμα*, the priest saith expressly, Accipite, comedite, ዝኅብስት፡ ሥጋየ፡ i.e. "Hic panis est corpus meum."

[y] Ibidem scripsit Lutherus, Verba evangelistæ, *Hoc est corpus meum*, hunc facere sensum, hic panis est corpus meum; quæ sententia aut accipi debet tropice, ut panis sit corpus Christi significative, aut est plane absurda et impossibilis, nec enim fieri potest ut panis sit corpus Christi. Bellarm. de eucharistia, l. 1. c. 1. [p. 466. vol. III.]

unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom, Matt. xxvi. 29. Where we see our Saviour himself, even after he had consecrated the wine, still calls it the fruit of the vine; and in saying that he will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, plainly shews that it was the fruit of the vine which he before drank. So that the very wine of which he said, *This is my blood*, was wine still, and the fruit of the vine; which I hope none of our adversaries will say the very blood of Christ is. But thirdly, this may be discovered also from the words of the apostle: *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* 1 Cor. x. 16. Where we may take notice of two things: first, that he here calls the sacramental elements still a cup or wine, and bread, *the bread which we break*, so that it is still bread; and secondly, that the cup of blessing is the communion of the blood, and the bread broken the communion of the body of Christ. Now if the bread be the communion of his body, and the cup the communion of his blood, it cannot be that the cup should be his real blood, and the bread his real body; for then it would be as much as if he should have said, The blood of Christ is the communion of the blood of Christ, and the body of Christ is the communion of the body of Christ; and so the body of Christ must be the communion of itself; which is impossible. To which we might also add the several places where the apostle still calls the elements bread and wine, or the cup: as, *For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup*, 1 Cor. xi. 26: *Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily*, ver. 27: *But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup*, ver. 28. From whence it is manifest, that that which we eat at the sacrament is bread, and not the very body of Christ; that which we drink, the cup or wine, and not the very blood of Christ; and therefore, that to say it is not bread nor wine, but the very body and blood of Christ, is repugnant to the plain words of the scripture.

The third thing is, that it overthroweth the nature of the sacrament; which I need not spend many words to prove.

For in a sacrament it is requisite, first, that there be some outward sign representing spiritual grace; whereas if the bread be really changed into the body of Christ, there is no outward sign at all in the sacrament, there being nothing else but the body and blood of Christ, which are not signs, but the thing signified. Nay, as St. Augustine[z] observes, the signs themselves are the sacrament, and therefore where there is no sign, there can be no sacrament. And so by depriving this sacred ordinance of its outward signs, they degrade it from being a sacrament, making it to have nothing of the nature of a sacrament in it. And therefore, if they will still hold that by the words of consecration the bread and wine are substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ, let them cease to call that holy action any longer a sacrament, and name it, *the body and blood of Christ;* for according to their opinion, there is nothing in it but the body and blood of Christ. So that it is plain, that by this doctrine the nature of a sacrament in general must be destroyed, or this sacrament in particular must be expunged out of their catalogue of sacraments.

The fourth and last thing here objected against this doctrine of transubstantiation is, that it hath given occasion to many superstitions, which any one that ever observed their customs and practices cannot but acknowledge. For this fond opinion possessing their brains, that the bread is the real body of Christ hung upon the cross, and pierced for their sins, O how zealous are they in wrapping it up neatly in their handkerchiefs, laying it up in their treasuries, carrying it about in their processions, yea, and at the length worshipping and adoring it too! which sad superstitions, yea, transgressions of theirs, we shall have occasion to speak of more presently.

In the meanwhile, to these four indictments, justly brought against the doctrine of transubstantiation, I shall add a fifth; and that is, that it is contrary to the judgment of the Fathers too, and therefore may justly be condemned. For Tertullian saith plainly, [a] "Having received bread and distributed it to his disciples, he made it his body, saying, *This is my body*, that is, the figure of my body." And in the sermon of extreme unction attributed to St. Cyprian, [b] "Our Lord therefore at the table, where he [c] partook of the last banquet with his apostles, with his own hands gave bread and wine; but in the cross he gave his body to be wounded by the hands of the soldiers, that in the apostles the sincere truth and true sincerity being more secretly impressed, might expound to the Gentiles, how wine and bread are his flesh and blood, and by what reasons the causes agree with the effects, and diverse names or species are brought to one essence, and the things signifying and the things signified should be called by the same names." So that it seems it was not his very body and blood, but bread and wine he then gave, and yet called by the same name with that they signified, even the body and blood of Christ.

---

[z] Nimis autem longum est convenienter disputare de varietate signorum, quæ cum ad res divinas pertinent sacramenta appellantur. Aug. epist. ad Marcellinum, [138. 7. vol. II.]

So Eusebius Cæsariensis: [d] "The memory of this sacrifice we celebrate at the Lord's table, by the symbols of his body and saving blood, according to the received constitutions of the New Testament." And Ephraem Antiochenus: [e] "And so the body of Christ received by the faithful is not turned from its sensible essence, and yet remains undivided from its spiritual grace." And Theodoret: [f] "But our Saviour changed their names, and gave the name of the symbol to the body, and the name of the body to the symbol:" not the things, but the names were changed. And therefore saith St. Augustine, [g] "For the Lord did not stick to say, *This is my body*, when he gave the sign of his body." And Acacius saith, [h] "The bread and wine sanctifies them that feed upon this matter." And Macarius of Egypt saith, [i] "In the church is offered bread and wine, the antitype of his body and blood."

---

[a] Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis suis corpus suum illum fecit, *Hoc est corpus meum* dicendo, id est figura corporis mei. Tertull. advers. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40. [vol. I.]

[b] Dedit itaque Dominus noster in mensa, in qua ultimum cum discipulis participavit convivium, propriis manibus panem et vinum; in cruce vero manibus militum corpus tradidit vulnerandum, ut in apostolis secretius impressa sincera veritas et vera sinceritas exponeret gentibus, quomodo vinum et panis caro esset et sanguis, et quibus rationibus causæ effectibus convenirent, et diversa nomina vel species ad unam reducerentur essentiam, et significantia et significata eisdem vocabulis censerentur. Cyprian. de extrema unctione, [p. 48. ad calc. Cypr. op.]

[c] MS. *partaked.*

[d] Τούτου δῆτα τοῦ θύματος μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν διὰ συμβόλων, τοῦτε σώματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος κατὰ θεσμοὺς τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης παρειληφότες. Euseb. demonst. evang. l. I. c. 10. p. 39 A.

[e] Οὕτως καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται, καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαίρετον μένει χάριτος. Ephraem. de sacris Antioch. legibus, [apud Photii Myriob. p. 793.]

[f] Ὁ δὲ γὲ σωτὴρ ὁ ἡμέτερος ἐνήλλαξε τὰ ὀνόματα, καὶ τῷ μὲν σώματι τὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα, τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ τὸ τοῦ σώματος. Theodoret. dial. 1. [p. 17. vol. IV.]

To these we may add that of Bertramus, otherwise called Ratramnus: [k] "What else but the substance of the wine is seen? It is clear, because the bread and wine are Christ's body and blood figuratively." And again: [l] "There is nothing more absurd than to take bread for flesh, and to call wine blood: neither would it be a mystery, wherein there is nothing secret and hidden contained. And how shall that be called the very body and blood of Christ wherein there is no change known to be made? And if they have endured no change, they are nothing else than what they were before." And again: [m] "For as to the substance of the creatures, what they were before consecration, that they are also after." And in the Comment upon St. Matthew, attributed to St. Chrysostom, we find it said, [n] "If therefore it be so dangerous to transfer the sanctified vessels to private uses, in which not the true body of Christ, but the mystery of his body is contained; how much more as for the vessels of our body, which God hath prepared for himself to dwell in, we ought not to give place to the devil to act in!" What could be spoken more plainly? It is not the body of Christ itself, but only the mystery and sacrament thereof, that is contained in the holy vessels and offered in the Lord's Supper.

---

[g] Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, *Hoc est corpus meum*, cum signum daret corporis sui. Aug. contra Adimant. c. 12. [3. vol. VIII.]

[h] Panis vinumque ex hac materia vescentes sanctificat. Acac. in Gen. 2. [p. 41. Zephyri Catenæ.]

[i] *Ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος, ἀντίτυπον τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος.* Macar. hom. 27. [17.]

[k] Quid aliud quam substantia vini conspicitur? Claret quia panis ille vinumque figurate Christi corpus et sanguis existit. Bertram. de corp. et sang. Christi, [p. 514. Petri Μικροπ.]

[l] Nihil absurdius quam panem carnem accipere et vinum sanguinem dicere. Nec jam mysterium erit, in quo nihil secreti nihil abditi continebitur: et quomodo jam corpus Christi et sanguis dicitur, in quo nulla permutatio facta esse cognoscitur? [Ibid.] Et si nihil permutationis pertulerunt, nihil aliud existunt quam quod prius fuerunt. Ibid. [p. 515.]

[m] Nam secundum creaturarum substantiam quod fuerunt ante consecrationem hoc et postea existunt. Ibid. [p. 519.]

[n] Si ergo hæc vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre sic periculosum est, in quibus non est verum corpus Christi sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur, quanto magis vasa corporis nostri, quæ sibi Deus ad habitaculum præparavit, non debemus locum dare diabolo agendi in eis quod vult? Comment. in Matt. hom. 11. ascript. Chrysost. [p. lxiii. vol. VI. edit. Bened.]

To all these testimonies I shall only add that of Theodoret again; [o] "The visible symbols he honoured with the name of his body and blood, not changing their nature, but adding grace to nature." And Gelasius, [p] "Truly the sacraments which we receive of the body and blood of Christ are a Divine thing, and by them we are made partakers of the Divine Nature, and yet the substance or nature of the bread and wine doth not cease to be." And therefore we conclude, that transubstantiation is both a doctrine that cannot be proved by the scriptures, is contrary to the scriptures, overthroweth the nature of sacraments, hath given occasion to many superstitions, and is also contrary to the judgment of the Fathers.

The body of Christ is given and taken and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.

It being so clear a truth, that the bread and wine are not turned into the very body and blood of Christ in the holy sacrament, we need not heap up many arguments to prove, that it is only after a spiritual, not after a corporal manner, that the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten in the sacrament. For if the bread be not really changed into the body of Christ, then the body of Christ is not really there present; and if it be not really there present, it is impossible it should be really eaten and received into our bodies as bread is. So that the truth there demonstrated, and the truth here delivered, have so much affinity to one another, that they cannot so well be called two as one and the same truth. And therefore to the arguments produced in the foregoing discourse, I shall add only these following, and that briefly, to shew that the body and blood of Christ are not eaten after a corporal but only a spiritual manner in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

---

[o] *Τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθεικώς.* Theodoret. dial. l. I. [p. 18. vol. IV.]

[p] Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ, et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Gelas. de duabus naturis in Christo, contra Eutychen, [p. 703. vol. VIII. Max. Bibl. Patr.]

First, therefore, it is impossible [q] that that body, which was but of the ordinary bulk with ours, should be sufficient, if eaten after a corporal manner, to feed and satisfy so many millions of millions of souls as have already, and may hereafter eat of it. And secondly, suppose it was not impossible, yet it would be unprofitable for us thus to eat of the body of Christ. For our Saviour himself having preached concerning the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, the Jews and Capernaites taking him (as their followers the papists do) in a carnal sense, cried out, *How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* John vi. 52. And his disciples themselves said, *This is an hard saying, who can hear it?* ver. 60. Whereupon he explained himself, and told them, [r] *It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life*, ver. 63. As if he should have said, Though I do speak of eating my flesh, I would not have you think that my very flesh profiteth any thing, or quickeneth; no, *It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing;*

---

[q] Deinde et hoc illos movere poterat cum ejusmodi sensum haberent, quod etsi ullo modo fas esse potuisset, sic illum concidi et manducari, sanguinemque ejus bibi, vix paucis sufficere ut unusquisque modicum quid acciperet, atque ideo vix centum homines ad vitam pertingere posse, cum copiosa multitudo hominum ad vitam pertinentium nulli nisi soli Deo numerabilis sit. Rupert. in Johan. [7. p. 211. vol. II.] *Πόσοις γὰρ ἤρκει τὸ σῶμα πρὸς βρῶσιν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦ κόσμου πάντος τοῦτο τροφὴ γένηται*: Athanas. in illud, Quicunque dixerit, &c. [epist. ad Seraph. IV. 19. vol. I.]

[r] Nam quia durum et intolerabilem existimaverunt sermonem ejus, quasi vere carnem suam comedendam determinasset, ut in spiritu deponeret statum salutis præmisit, *spiritus est qui vivificat;* atque ita subjunxit, *caro nihil prodest,* ad vivificandum scilicet. Tertull. de resurrectione carnis, c. 37. [vol. III.]

and the words that I speak unto you are not to be understood in a carnal, but a spiritual sense, for they are spirit and life: plainly shewing that the corporal eating of his body is unprofitable, and that whatsoever he said concerning eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood was still to be understood in a heavenly and [s]spiritual sense. Thirdly, upon this supposition, that the body of Christ is corporally eaten in the sacrament, it follows that it was corporally broken too, and so that Christ did really break his own body, before the Jews broke it for him; yea, and that Christ received his own body into his own body: for that he received this sacrament himself, as well as administered to his disciples, is plain, not only from the testimonies of the [t]Fathers, but from the words of our Saviour himself: *With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer*, Luke xxii. 15; and, *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom,* Matt. xxvi. 29. So that I cannot see how it can possibly be denied, that Christ ate of the bread whereof he said, *This is my body;* and if he ate it, and ate it corporally, that is, ate his very body as we eat bread, then he ate himself, and made one body two, and then crowded them into one again, putting his body into his body, even his whole body into part of his body, his stomach; and so he must be thought not only to have two bodies, but two bodies so as to be one within another; yea, so as to be one eaten and devoured by another; the absurdity of which and the like assertions, he that hath but half an eye may easily discover. So that it must needs be granted to be in a spiritual manner that this sacrament was then instituted, and by consequence that it is in a spiritual manner that this sacrament ought now to be received.

---

[s] *Θεῖα καὶ πνευμάτικά ἐστιν οὐδὲν ἔχοντα σαρκικὸν, οὐδὲ ἀκολουθίαν φυσικήν.* Chrysost in loc. [p. 750. 34. vol. II.] Ille autem instruxit eos et ait illis, *spiritus est qui vivificat, caro autem nihil prodest. Verba quæ locutus sum vobis spiritus est et vita.* Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus sum. Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis, et bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi; spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos. Aug. in Psal. 98. [9. vol. IV.

[t] Nec Moses dedit nobis panem verum sed Dominus Jesus, ipse conviva et convivium, ipse comedens et qui comeditur. Hieron. Epist. [120. 2. vol. I.] ad Hedibiam. *Ἵν' οὖν μὴ καὶ τότε ταραχθῶσι, πρῶτος αὐτὸς τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, ἐνάγων αὐτοὺς ἀταράχως εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν μυστηρίων, διὰ τοῦτο οὖν τὸ αὐτοῦ αἷμα ἔπιεν.* Chrysost. in Mat. hom. 82. [p. 510. 29. vol. II.] Unde et primo ipse corpus suum et sanguinem sumpsit, et postea discipulis sumendum tradidit. Thom. [par. III. vol. XII.] quæst. 81. Art. 1.

And this was the judgment of the Fathers. Macarius saith, [u] "In the church is offered bread and wine, the antitype of his flesh and blood; and they that partake of the visible bread do spiritually eat of the flesh of Christ."

And St. Augustine: [x] "Understand spiritually what I say unto you; you must not eat that body which you see, nor drink that blood which they will shed that crucify me. I have commended to you a certain sacrament; being spiritually understood, it will quicken you; though it be necessary it should be celebrated visibly, yet it must be understood invisibly." For as Ælfrick archbishop of Canterbury saith, [y] "That bread is Christ's body, not bodily but spiritually;" and if so, it must needs be eaten spiritually, not bodily.

And it being thus only after a spiritual manner that we receive the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, there can be no other means whereby we can receive him but faith. And therefore saith Origen, [z] "That food which is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, as to the material part of it, it goes into the belly, and is cast out into the draught; but as to the prayer which is added to it, it is made profitable by the proportion of faith." And St. Cyprian, [a] "Drinking and eating belong to the same reason, whereby as the bodily substance is nourished, and liveth, and remains safe, so is the life of the spirit nourished by this proper food: and what eating is to the flesh, that is faith to the soul; what food is to the body, that is the word to the spirit, working eternally by a more excellent virtue what the carnal elements do temporally and finally." And afterwards: [b] "As often as we do these things, we do not whet our teeth to bite, but by a sincere faith we break the holy bread and divide it, whilst we distinguish and separate what is divine and what is human, and joining the things separated together again, we acknowledge one God and man."

---

[u] *Ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος, ἀντίτυπον τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος, καὶ οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἐκ τοῦ φαινομένου ἄρτου πνευματικῶς τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίουσι.* Macar. Ægypt. hom. 27. [17.]

[x] Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus sum. Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis, et bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod commendavi vobis; spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos. Etsi necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet tamen invisibiliter intelligi. Aug. in Psal. 98. [9.] V. et Gratian. de consecrat. dist. 2. cap. 44, 45. [pp. 1893, 1894.]

[y] Ðæꞇ huꞅel iꞅ Cꞃiꞅꞇeꞅ lichama na lichamlice ac ᵹaꞅꞇlice. Ælfric. epist. ad Wulfsin Schyrburn. [p. 45.]

[z] Ille cibus qui sanctificatur per verbum Dei perque obsecrationem, juxta id quod habet materiale, in ventrem abit et in secessum ejicitur; cæterum juxta precationem quæ illi accessit, proportione fidei fit utilis. Origen. in Mat. 15. [p. 499. vol. III.]

In St. Augustine we meet with many expressions to this purpose: [c] "How," saith he, "shall I send up my hand to heaven to lay hold upon him sitting there? Send thy faith, and thou hast laid hold on him." And again: [d] "For to believe in him, this is to eat the living bread; he that believeth in him eateth; he is invisibly fattened who is invisibly regenerated." And again: [e] "This therefore is to eat the food that doth not perish but endureth to eternal life. Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten." So that it is faith whereby we feed upon the body and blood of Christ, and therefore it is not carnally but spiritually that we receive it.

---

[a] Potus et esus ad eandem pertinent rationem, quibus sicut corporea nutritur substantia, et vivit, et incolumis perseverat, ita vita spiritus hoc proprio alimento nutritur: et quod est esca carni, hoc animæ est fides; quod cibus corpori hoc verbum spiritui, excellentiori virtute peragens æternaliter, quod agunt alimenta carnalia temporaliter et finaliter. Cyprian. de cœna Domini, [p. 41. ad calc.]

[b] Hæc quoties agimus, non dentes ad mordendum acuimus, sed fide sincera panem sanctum frangimus et partimur, dum quod divinum et quod humanum est distinguimus et separamus, itemque simul separata jungentes [unum] Deum et hominem fatemur. Ibid. [fin.]

[c] Quomodo in cœlum manum mittam ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte et tenuisti. Aug. in Johan. tract. 50. [4. vol. III.]

[d] Credere enim in eum hoc est manducare panem vivum. Qui credit in eum manducat; invisibiliter saginatur qui invisibiliter renascitur. Ibid. tract. 26. [1.]

[e] Hoc est ergo manducare cibum qui non perit sed qui permanet in vitam æternam. Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti. Ibid. tract. 25. [12.]

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

The sacramental bread and wine being vainly fancied to be changed into the very body and blood of Christ, it was presently conceived that something more than ordinary honour should be conferred upon it, yea that it was not only to be eaten, but laid up privately, yea carried about publicly, lifted up, and worshipped too, and that with the same [f] worship which is due to the true and living God: and therefore have they appointed a certain holyday [g] too, which they call *Corpus Christi* day, wherein the sacramental bread might be annually carried about and religiously worshipped.

Now we having before proved that this bread is not the very body of Christ, but bread still after as well as before consecration, we have overthrown the very foundations of these gross superstitions; it being only upon that account that they perform so much homage and worship to it, because they think it is not what it seems to be, real bread, but what it doth not seem to be, even the very body of Christ. And the foundation being thus destroyed, the superstructure falls of itself; or if it still stands, it must but be like a castle in the air, without any foundation. To what was therefore before proved, I shall wish the opposers of this truth, or the maintainers of the reservation and adoration of the sacraments, to consider these things:

First, That that doctrine is contrary to Christ's institution. For he said expressly, *Take, eat,* Matth. xxvi. 26; not, take and reserve it, not, take and carry it about, not, take and worship it, but, *Take and eat; this is my body.* Neither need

---

[f] Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles, pro more in catholica ecclesia semper recepto, latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant. Concil. Trident. sess. 13. cap. 5. [vol. X.]

[g] Declarat præterea sancta synodus pie et religiose admodum in Dei ecclesia inductum fuisse hunc morem, ut singulis annis peculiari quodam et festo die, præcelsum hoc et venerabile sacramentum singulari veneratione et solennitate celebraretur, utque in processionibus reverenter et honorifice illud per vias et loca publica circumferretur. Ibid.

I heap up many arguments to prove, that according to Christ's institution the sacramental bread is not to be reserved, much less worshipped, but eaten; for our adversaries themselves, the reverend fathers in the council of Trent, do acknowledge it[h]. And therefore, howsoever or whensoever this superstition first crep into the church, by their own confession it is contrary to Christ's institution. Secondly, That it quite overthrows the nature of the sacrament. For according to St. Augustine's rule, [i]"If sacraments have not a certain resemblance of the things whereof they are sacraments, they are no sacraments at all." Now wherein is there any resemblance betwixt the body of Christ and bread, but only in the eating? Even because the one received by faith nourisheth and preserveth the spiritual, as the other received into the stomach doth the natural life. The bread itself hath no resemblance at all of his body, neither hath the bread as reserved, or carried about, or worshipped, any such resemblance; all the resemblance it hath, is in its feeding the body as Christ doth the soul. [k]Christ is the nourishment of our souls, as bread is the nourishment of our bodies; and therefore doth he sometimes call his body bread, and at other times bread his body. And all the resemblance betwixt them consisting only in the bread's nourishment of the body as Christ doth the soul; if the bread should lose its nourishing faculty, it would not be any whit like to Christ's body, nor could it be the sacrament of it; and whensoever bread is not eaten, but reserved or carried about, though it may have it, yet it doth not exert any such virtue, and by consequence loseth its resemblance to Christ's body, and so ceaseth to be sacramental bread any longer. And therefore they must know, that the bread they reserve and carry about is not the body of Christ, nor hath any relation to it upon that very account, because they reserve and carry it about, and do not eat it.

---

[h] Neque enim ideo minus est adorandum quod fuerit a Christo Domino ut sumatur institutum. Ibid.

[i] Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Aug. Epist. [98. 9. vol. II.] ad Bonifacium.

[k] Sicut panis communis quem quotidie edimus vita est corporis, ita panis iste supersubstantialis vita est animæ et sanitas mentis. Cyprian. de cœna Domini, [p. 40. ad calc.] Potus et esus ad eandem pertinent rationem, quibus sicut corporea nutritur substantia, et vivit et incolumis perseverat, ita vita spiritus hoc proprio alimento nutritur. Ibid. [p. 41.]

And if these considerations will not convince them, let them in the last place take notice of the testimonies of the primitive church. Origen (or as others think St. Cyril) saith, [l] "The Lord said to them, concerning the bread which he gave to his disciples, *Take and eat;* he did not defer it, nor command it to be kept till to-morrow." And St. Cyprian, shewing the difference betwixt the sacramental bread and the shew-bread, saith, the sacramental bread [m] "is incorporated not injured, received not included." As if he should have said, the shew-bread was included in the ark of the covenant, but so is not this; it is only received, not included or shut up in any thing, and by consequence not reserved. And in the Second Epistle to St. James, attributed to Clemens Romanus, we find it written, [n] "Let as many sacrifices be offered upon the altar as may suffice the people: and if any remain, let them not be reserved till to-morrow, but with fear and dread be consumed by the diligence of the clerks."

To this purpose also it was determined in the Cæsaraugustane council: [o] "If it be proved that any one, having received the grace of the Lord's supper, hath not consumed or eaten it up, let him be anathema for ever." And in the first council at Toledo, [p] "If any one shall not consume the eucharist received of the priest, let him be put away as a sacrilegious person." Which canon was explained and confirmed again in the eleventh council at Toledo, an. 675[q].

To this we may also add the several ways whereby the primitive church used to dispose of the sacramental bread and wine which was left after the communicants had all received. Evagrius tells us, [r] "There was an ancient custom at Constantinople, that when many pieces of the undefiled body of Christ our Lord were left after the communion, such young youths as went to school were sent for, and eat them up." But St. Jerome tells us, that [s] "after the communion, whatsoever was left of the bread and wine, the communicants themselves eating a common supper in the church, did consume them together." And Hesychius saith, [t] "What was left used to be consumed in the fire." Whence we may observe, that even what was left after the communion was not reserved; but though some used one, others another way, yet all used some way or other to consume it, so that it might not be reserved.

---

[l] Dominus de pane, quem discipulis dabat, dicebat eis, *Accipite et manducate;* non distulit, nec reservari jussit in crastinum. Origen. in Lev. hom. 5. [vol. II. p. 211.]

[m] Incorporatur non injuriatur, recipitur non includitur. Cyprian. de cœna Domini, [p. 42.]

[n] Tanta in altario holocausta offerantur quanta populo sufficere debeant. Quod si remanserint, non reserventur in crastinum, sed cum timore et tremore clericorum diligentia consumantur. Clem. Epist. 2. ad Jac. [p. 360.]

[o] Eucharistiæ gratiam si quis probatur acceptam in ecclesia non sumpsisse, anathema sit in perpetuum. Concil. Cæsaraugust. can. 3. [Concil. vol. I.]

[p] Si quis autem acceptam a sacerdote eucharistiam non sumpserit, velut sacrilegus propellatur. Concil. Tolet. 1. c. 14. [p. 991. vol. I.]

[q] Concil. Tolet. undecim. cap. 11. [p. 1028. vol. III.]

And if the primitive church was against the reservation, surely it was much more against the adoration of the sacrament, holding, as we have shewed before, that no person or thing, under any pretence whatsoever, ought to be worshipped besides God. I know it is not bare bread our adversaries say they worship, but Christ in the bread, or the bread in the name of Christ. But I wish them to consider what Gregory Nyssen long ago said, [u] "He that worshippeth a creature, though he do it in the name of Christ, is an idolater, giving the name of Christ to an idol." And therefore, let them not be angry at us for concluding them to be idolaters, whilst they eat one piece of the bread, and worship the other; and for asserting that *the sacraments ought to be reserved, carried about, or worshipped.*

---

[r] *Ἔθος παλαιὸν βούλεται ἀνὰ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν, ὅτ᾽ ἂν πολύ τι χρῆμα τῶν ἁγίων μερίδων τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματος Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐναπομείνοι, παῖδας ἀφθόρους μεταπέμπτους γίγνεσθαι περὶ τῶν ἐς χαμαιδιδασκάλους φοιτώντων, καὶ ταῦτα κατεσθίειν.* Evagr. hist. eccles. l. 4. c. [36.]

[s] Et post communionem quæcunque eis de sacrificiis superfuissent, illi in ecclesia communem cœnam comedentes pariter consumebant. Hieron. in 1 Cor. xi. [p. 931. vol. XI.]

[t] Sed hoc quod reliquum est de carnibus et panibus in igne incendi præcepit. Quod nunc videmus etiam sensibiliter in ecclesia fieri, ignique tradi quæcunque remanere contigerit inconsumpta. Hesych. in Lev. l. 2. [p. 49. D.]

[u] *Ὁ γὰρ τὸ κτίσμα προσκυνῶν, κἂν ἐπ᾽ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτο ποιῇ, εἰδωλολάτρης ἐστὶ, τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄνομα τῷ εἰδώλῳ θέμενος.* Greg. Nyssen. orat. funeb. Placillæ, [p. 533. vol. III.]

ARTICLE XXIX.

OF THE WICKED, WHICH DO NOT EAT THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST IN THE USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.

IT being not after a carnal but spiritual manner only, as we have seen in the foregoing article, that the body and blood of Christ are eaten and drunken in the sacrament, it must needs be a spiritual person, not a carnal, that can eat and drink it. For though a spiritual person may do some things carnally, yet a carnal person can never do any thing spiritually. And therefore, though godly and spiritual men may feed upon the body and blood of Christ [a] out of the sacrament as well as in it, yet wicked and carnal men miss of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament as well as out of it. They may indeed eat the bread which signifies the Lord, but they cannot feed upon the Lord which is signified by the bread. They may take down the bread and wine into their bodies, but not receive the body and blood of Christ into their souls. And truly, we need not go far to prove this, even that wicked men do not eat the body and blood of Christ; for if they eat the body and blood of Christ they are not wicked men, but such as dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in them; as Christ himself assures us, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him*, John vi. 56. He that dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him, can be no wicked man; but he that eats and drinks the body and blood of Christ, dwells in Christ, and hath Christ dwelling in him, and therefore cannot possibly be a wicked man. And if he that eats and drinks the body and blood of Christ can be no wicked man, it must needs follow that no wicked man can eat and drink the body and blood of Christ.

---

[a] Bibere autem dicimur sanguinem Christi, non solum sacramentorum ritu, sed et cum sermones ejus recipimus in quibus vita consistit. Origen. in Numb. xxiv. [hom. xvi. fin. vol. II. p. 334.] Nulli est aliquatenus ambigendum tunc unumquemque fidelium corporis sanguinisque Dominici participem fieri, quando in baptismate membrum Christi efficitur, nec alienari ab illius panis calicisque consortio, etiamsi antequam panem illum comedat et calicem bibat, de hoc sæculo in unitate corporis Christi constitutus abscedat. Sacramenti quippe illius participatione ac beneficio non privatur, quando ipse hoc, quod illud sacramentum significat, invenit. Aug. serm. ad infantes de sacramento, apud Bedam in 1 Cor. x. [Bed. p. 365. vol. VI.]

But this is not all: for a wicked man doth not only miss of the grace signified by the bread and wine; but in eating and drinking the bread and wine that signify that grace, they do but eat and drink damnation to themselves. For the apostle saith expressly, *Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of Christ*, 1 Cor. xi. 27; yea, *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body*, ver. 29. Not as if the sacraments themselves were the cause of their damnation; but because their coming with sinful hearts to it [b]becomes an aggravation of their sins; even as Christ himself, who came into the world for our salvation, by reason of their unbelief, becomes to many an occasion of their greater damnation, John iii. 19. And thus the same sacrament that is to the godly the savour of life unto life, and not of death unto death, to the wicked is the savour of death unto death only, and not of life unto life; the one finds a blessing in it, and no breach, the other finds a breach in it, and no blessing; the one so eats and drinks the bread and wine, as to partake of the body and blood of Christ, the other eats and drinks the bread and wine, so as to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ; the one eats and drinks salvation, the other damnation to himself.

---

[b] *Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ παρουσία αὐτοῦ, ἡ τὰ μεγάλα ἐκεῖνα καὶ ἀπόρρητα κομίσασα ἡμῖν ἀγαθὰ, τοὺς μὴ δεξαμένους αὐτὴν μᾶλλον κατέκρινεν· οὕτω καὶ τὰ μυστήρια μείζονος ἐφόδια κολάσεως γίνεται τοῖς ἀναξίως μετέχουσι.* Chrysost. in 1 Corinth. hom. 28. [p. 424. 13. vol. III.]

And this was the doctrine of the primitive church. Origen saith, [c] "Many things may be spoken also concerning the Word itself, which was made flesh and true food, whom whosoever eateth shall certainly live to eternity, whom no wicked man can eat. For if it could be that he that still remains a sinner should eat the Word which wás made flesh, seeing he is the Word and the bread of life, it would not have been written, *Whosoever eateth this bread shall live for ever:*" and how they get hurt too as well as no good at the sacrament, the same Father expresseth it elsewhere, saying, [d] "Dost thou not fear to communicate of the body of Christ when thou comest to the eucharist, as if thou wast clean, as if thou hadst nothing of unworthiness in thee? and in all these things dost thou think thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Dost thou not remember what is said, *For for this cause many are weak and sick, and many sleep amongst you?* Why are many weak? Because they do not judge nor examine themselves, nor understand what it is to communicate with the church, nor what it is to come to such and so great sacraments. They suffer what they that are sick of fevers use to suffer whilst they presume to eat the meat of the healthful, bringing destruction to themselves."

To this purpose makes that of St. Cyprian; [e] "The sacraments, as much as in them is, can never be without their proper virtue, neither doth the Divine Majesty any way absent itself from the mysteries. But though the sacraments suffer themselves to be taken and touched by unworthy persons, yet they cannot be partakers of the Spirit, whose infidelity and unworthiness contradicts so great piety. Therefore to some these gifts are the savour of life unto life, to others the savour of death unto death." And elsewhere: [f] "He that is down threatens them that stand, and the wounded such as are whole; and because he may not presently receive the body of the Lord with his polluted hands, or drink the blood of the Lord with his defiled mouth, the sacrilegious fellow is angry at the priests. But O thy exceeding madness, thou furious person! Thou art angry at him that strives to turn the wrath of God from thee! Thou threatenest him that beggeth the mercy of God for thee, who is sensible of thy wound, which thou thyself art not sensible of!"

---

[c] Multa porro et de ipso verbo dici possent quod factum est caro, verusque cibus, quem qui comederit omnino vivet in æternum, quem nullus malus potest edere. Etenim si fieri posset, ut qui malus adhuc perseverat edat verbum factum carnem, cum sit verbum et panis vivus, nequaquam scriptum fuisset, *Quisquis ederit panem hunc vivet in æternum.* Origen. in Mat. xv. [p. 500. vol. III.]

[d] Communicare non times corpus Christi accedens ad eucharistiam quasi mundus et purus, quasi nihil in te sit indignum, et in his omnibus putas quia effugias judicium Dei? Non recordaris illud quod dictum est, *Quia propterea in vobis infirmi et ægri et dormiunt multi?* Quare multi infirmi? Quoniam seipsos non dijudicant neque seipsos examinant, nec intelligunt quid est communicare tam eximia sacramenta. Patiuntur hoc quod febricitantes pati solent, cum sanorum cibos præsumunt sibimetipsis inferentes exitium. Id. in Psal. 37. hom. 2. [p. 688. vol. II.]

[e] Sacramenta quidem, quantum in se est, sine propria esse virtute non possunt, nec ullo modo divina se

But I need not search the Fathers for the confirmation of this article, for it is indeed almost word for word taken out of a Father, St. Augustine by name, who is quoted in it; for he in his Comment upon the Gospel of St. John hath this passage, [g] "And by this, he that doth not dwell in Christ, and in whom Christ doth not dwell, without all doubt doth not spiritually eat his body nor drink his blood, though he may carnally and visibly press with his teeth the sacrament of the

absentat majestas mysteriis. Sed quamvis ab indignis se sumi vel contingi sacramenta permittant, non possunt tamen spiritus esse participes, quorum infidelitas vel indignitas tantæ sanctitudini contradicit. Ideoque aliis sunt hæc munera odor vitæ in vitam, aliis odor mortis in mortem. Cyprian. de cœna Domini, [p. 41. ad calc.]

[f] Jacens stantibus et integris vulneratus minatur, et quod non statim Domini corpus inquinatis manibus accipiat, aut ore polluto Domini sanguinem bibat, sacerdotibus sacrilegus irascitur. Atque o tuam nimiam furiose dementiam! irasceris ei qui abs te avertere iram Dei nititur! ei minaris qui pro te Domini misericordiam deprecatur, qui vulnus tuum sentit, quod ipse non sentis! Id. serm. de lapsis, [p. 131.]

[g] Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo et in quo non manet Christus, proculdubio nec manducat spiritualiter carnem ejus nec bibit ejus sanguinem, licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi. Sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit, quia immundus præsumpsit ad Christi accedere sacramenta quæ aliquis non digne sumit nisi qui mundus est. Aug. in Joh. tract. 26. [18. vol. III. par. ii.]

body and blood of Christ; but rather, to his judgment or condemnation, eateth and drinketh the sacrament of so great a thing; because being unclean, he presumed to come to the sacraments of Christ, which no one can worthily receive but he that is clean." In which passage the sense of this article being so fully contained, and it being the place, I suppose, cited in the article itself, I shall not add any more to it; but only conclude with that of St. Basil: [h] "Let us therefore cleanse ourselves from all defilements, and so let us come to these holy things, that we may escape the judgment of those that killed the Lord. For whosoever eateth this bread, and drinketh this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord."

---

[h] *Καθαρεύσωμεν τοίνυν ἀπὸ πάντος μολυσμοῦ, καὶ οὕτως προσέρχωμεν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἵνα φύγωμεν τὸ κρίμα τῶν φονευσάντων τὸν Κύριον· διότι ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον, ἢ πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως, ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου.* Basil. de baptismo, l. 2. quæst. 3. [vol. I.]

ARTICLE XXX.

OF BOTH KINDS.

The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people; for both the parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

WHEN our Lord Christ instituted the sacrament of his supper, he was pleased to ordain two signs to be used in the administration of it, bread and wine, the one to represent his body, the other his blood. But about four hundred years ago, the church of Rome, for reasons best known to herself, thought good to make a countermand, that bread and wine should not be both administered to all communicants, but that the lay people should be content with the bread only without the wine, yea and the clergy too, if there were any present besides him that consecrated it. So that in few words [a] they ordained and still use to deny the cup, and to administer the bread only to all the communicants, the priest that consecrates it reserving every drop of the wine for himself. Now against this wild practice of the church of Rome our church of England is pleased in this article to set herself, determining that the cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people. Neither is this only here asserted, but confirmed too: so that I need go no further for the proof of the article than to the article itself. And the reason that is here brought is from Christ's institution and command, *For by the ordinance and commandment of Christ, both the parts of the sacrament*, viz. both bread and wine, *ought to be administered to all Christian men.* And to prove this proof of the article, we make take notice of the words of institution themselves. After therefore he had distributed the bread, St. Matthew saith, *And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it*, Matt. xxvi. 27. St. Mark, *And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it*, Mark xiv. 23. St. Luke, *Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you*, Luke xxii. 20. St. Paul, *After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me*, 1 Cor. xi. 25. In all which places we may observe all these things making for our purpose. First, that the bread is never spoken of, but still the cup is brought in after it. Secondly, that as the bread is still brought in to represent his body, not his blood, so is the cup still brought in to represent his blood, not his body. So that neither of them is appointed to represent both; and by consequence, he that is partaker of the bread only doth not partake of his blood; neither doth he that is partaker of the wine only partake of his body; but to partake both of body and blood, we must receive both the bread and wine. Thirdly, that St. Luke ushers in the institution of the cup with the word *likewise*, *Likewise also the cup;* and St. Paul, *After the same manner also the cup;* so that after the same manner that he instituted the bread, he instituted the cup also: now our adversaries themselves acknowledge he instituted the bread so as to be communicated to all; and therefore we may well say, he *likewise* and *after the same manner* instituted the cup to be administered to all. Fourthly, that in St. Matthew he said, *Drink ye all of it*, and in St. Mark, *They all drank of it*, expressions not to be found in the institution of the bread; as if he foresaw this very corruption that the devil would bring into his ordinance, even that though all should be suffered to eat the bread, yet all should not be suffered to drink the cup. Therefore hath he left a particular command, that all should drink of the cup; so that if either of the parts might be omitted, certainly the bread should be rather omitted than the cup, it being so expressly and in plain terms commanded, that all should drink of the cup; whereas there is no such express command for all to eat of the bread. And our Saviour commanding them all to drink of it, in obeisance to his command they all drank of it; so that though it be not said, *They all ate the bread*, yet it is said, *They all drank of the cup*, even all the communicants, as well as he that consecrated it; to shew us that all are to drink the cup as well as eat the bread. Nay, lastly, it is here said, *Do this, as oft as ye do it, in remembrance of me. Do this:* what? Eat the bread only? No. Drink the cup only? No; but administer and receive both bread and cup, in remembrance of me, who have now administered both unto you. And therefore, *Do this*, was not brought in till the cup was administered as well as the bread. And therefore it cannot possibly be denied, but that according to Christ's institution the cup is to be administered to all Christian men as well as the bread, that being an essential part of the sacrament as well as this. And seeing Christ hath joined them both together, it is not for man to put them asunder; but as St. Cyprian observes, [b]"We are admonished, that in offering the cup the tradition of the Lord is to be observed; neither is any thing to be done by us, but what the Lord hath done before us." And afterwards, [c]"If it be not lawful to break the least of Christ's commands, how much more is it not lawful to infringe such great ones, so mysterious, so much appertaining to the sacrament of the Lord's passion and our redemption, or to change it by human tradition into any thing else but what was divinely instituted!" And St. Ambrose, [d] "He saith, it is unworthy of the Lord, whosoever celebrates the mystery otherwise than it was delivered. For he cannot be devout who presumes otherwise than is given by the Author. Therefore he (St. Paul) admonisheth that his mind who comes to the eucharist of the Lord be devout according to the order that is delivered."

---

[a] Quod vero ad communicandi ritum pertinet, doceant parochi sanctæ ecclesiæ lege interdictum esse ne quis sine ipsius ecclesiæ autoritate, præter sacerdotes corpus Domini in sacrificio conficientes, sub utraque specie sacram eucharistiam sumat. Catechism. ad parochos, [par. ii. de euch. 69. p. 210.]

---

[b] Admonitos nos scias quod in calice offerendo Dominica traditio servetur, neque aliud fiat a nobis quam quod pro nobis Dominus prior fecerit. Cypriani epist. lib. 2. epist. [63.] ad Cæcilium fratrem.

[c] Quod si nec minima de mandatis Dominicis licet solvere, quanto magis tam magna, tam grandia, tam ad ipsum Dominicæ passionis et nostræ redemptionis sacramentum pertinentia fas non est infringere, aut in aliud quam quod divinitus institutum est humana traditione mutare? Ibid. [p. 155.]

To this institution of Christ, I might add many more reasons to prove, that in the Lord's Supper both bread and wine are to be administered; but that its very being the Lord's supper, one should think, might be reason enough for it; for it is but a bad supper where there is bread only, and not drink. So that to deny the cup to the communicants is to deprive them of one part of their supper; yea, and to deprive the communion itself of the perfect nature of a sacrament, by destroying the analogy betwixt the sign and the thing signified, which, as we have seen, consisteth in the resemblance there is betwixt bread and wine's nourishing of our bodies, and Christ's feeding of our souls. Whereas we know that bread without wine, or some liquid thing or other in its stead, is not the whole and perfect nourishment of our bodies; and therefore not like to Christ, who is alone the perfect food and nourishment of our souls. And [e] seeing therefore this sacrament was ordained for the spiritual nourishment of our souls, as bread and wine together make up the perfect nourishment of our bodies, neither of them is to be denied to any, but both administered to all communicants.

And if we consult antiquity, we shall find that in the first three hundred years besure the people partaked of the cup as well as bread. In the Liturgy ascribed to St. James it is said, [f] "And when the deacons take the dishes and cups to distribute to the people." And Justin Martyr in his second Apology for Christians saith expressly, [g] "But the president having given thanks, and all the people praised God, those which are called deacons by us give to every one that is present to partake of the consecrated bread and wine and water; and they carry it also to those that are not present." And St. Cyprian, [h] "There are some either ignorantly or simply consecrating the Lord's cup, and administering it to the common people, do not that which Jesus Christ our Lord and God, the author and doctor of this sacrifice, did and taught." And elsewhere, [i] "Where the solemnities being ended, the deacon begins to offer the cup to those that are present." Yea, and Ignatius, [k] "For there is one flesh of the Lord Christ, and his blood one that was shed for us; one bread that is broken to all, and one cup that is distributed to all."

---

[d] Indignum dicit Domino, qui aliter mysterium celebrat quam ab eo traditum est. Non enim potest devotus esse qui aliter præsumit quam datum est ab autore. Itaque præmonet ut secundum ordinem traditum devota mens sit accedentis ad eucharistiam Domini. Ambros. in 1 Cor. xi. [27. App. vol. II.]

[e] Hoc sacramentum ordinatur ad spiritualem refectionem quæ corporali conformatur. Ad corporalem autem refectionem duo requiruntur, scilicet cibus, qui est alimentum siccum, et potus, qui est alimentum humidum. Et ideo etiam ad integritatem hujus sacramenti duo concurrunt, scilicet spiritualis cibus et spiritualis potus. Thom. part. 3. q. 73. Art. [2. vol. XII.]

Neither did the next three hundred years deny the people what the first, according to Christ's institution, granted them. [l] "This is the manner," saith Athanasius, "of this cup, and no other; this do you lawfully give the people to drink of." And St. Hilary, [m] "If the faults be not so great, that a man may be excommunicated, he ought not to separate himself from the medicine of the body and blood of the Lord." [n]"Not," saith St. Chrysostome, "as it was in the Old Testament, the priest ate some things and the people another, and it was not lawful for the people to partake of those things which the priest partaked of; it is not so now, but one body and one cup is now propounded to all." Yea, Gelasius saith, [o]"The division of one and the same mystery cannot happen without great sacrilege." To pass by others, as [p]Leo Romanus and [q]Gregorius Turonensis, both of which lived about this time, and gave testimony to this truth, Remigius saith, [r]"The cup itself is also called the communion, as if he should have said the partaking; because all communicate or partake of it, and receive their part in the blood of Christ."

---

[f] *Ὅτε δὲ ἐπαίρουσιν οἱ διάκονοι τοὺς δίσκους καὶ τοὺς κρατῆρας εἰς τὸ μεταδοῦναι τῷ λαῷ.* Liturg. Jacob. [p. 21.]

[g] *Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος πάντος τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου, καὶ οἴνου, καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.* Justin. apol. [I. 65.]

[h] Tamen quoniam quidam vel ignoranter vel simpliciter in calice Dominico sanctificando et plebi administrando non hoc faciunt quod Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster sacrificii hujus auctor et doctor fecit et docuit. Cypriani epist. [63. init.] ad Cæcilium fratrem.

[i] Ubi solennibus adimpletis calicem diaconus offerre præsentibus cœpit. Id. de lapsis, [p. 132.]

[k] *Μία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ σάρξ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἓν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκχυθὲν, εἷς καὶ ἄρτος τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐθρύφθη, καὶ ἓν ποτήριον τοῖς ὅλοις διενεμήθη.* Ignat. epist. ad Philad. [p. 96.]

[l] *Οὗτος ὁ τρόπος τούτου τοῦ ποτηρίου μόνος, ἄλλος οὐδείς· τοῦτο ὑμεῖς νομίμως προπίνετε τοῖς λαοῖς.* Athanas. apol. 2. [p. 133. vol. I.]

[m] Si non sunt tanta peccata ut excommunicetur quis, non se debet a medicina corporis et sanguinis Domini separare. Hilar. apud Gratian. de consecrat. distinct. 2 can. Cum omne crimen, [p. 1880.]

To these we may add the next three hundred years too. Gregory the Great saith, [s]"His body in the sacrament is taken; his flesh is divided for the people's salvation; his blood is poured not into the hands of unbelievers, but into the mouths of believers." And Gregory the Second, [t]"The high priests, when any one hath sinned and made confession, when they have chastised and afflicted him enough with hunger, they give him the precious body of the Lord, and make him drink of his holy blood." Yea, and Gregory the Third too saith, [u]"But to lepers, if they be believing Christ-

[n] *Οὐ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς τὰ μὲν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἤσθιε, τὰ δὲ ὁ ἀρχόμενος· καὶ θέμις οὐκ ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν ὧν μετεῖχεν ὁ ἱερεὺς, ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἓν σῶμα πρόκειται καὶ ἓν ποτήριον.* Chrysost. in 2 Cor. hom. 14.

[o] Quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire. Gelas. can. de consecrat. dist. 2. [apud Decr. Grat. pp. 1878, 9.]

[p] V. Leon. de quadrag. sermo quart. [5.]

[q] V. Greg. Turon. de gloria martyrum, c. 10. [p. 833. vol. XI. Max. Bibl. Patr.]

[r] Appellatur et ipse calix communicatio, quasi participatio, quia omnes communicant ex illo, partemque sumunt ex sanguine Domini. Remig. in 1 Cor. 11. [vol. VIII. Ibid.] v. et Haym. in eund. loc.

[s] Ejus ibi corpus sumitur, ejus caro in populi salutem partitur: ejus sanguis non tam in manus infidelium, sed in ora fidelium funditur. Greg. Mag. dialog. l. 4. c. 58. [p. 472. vol. II.]

[t] Pontifices, ubi peccarit quis et confessus fuerit, cum probe castigaverint, probe fame afflixerint; tum pretiosum illi Domini corpus impertiunt, et sancto illum sanguine potant. Greg. sec. epist. ad Leonem Isaurum, [p. 15. vol. IV. Concil. Hard.]

[u] Leprosis autem, si fideles Christiani fuerint, Dominici corporis et sanguinis participatio tribuatur. Greg. tert. epist. 1. ad Bonifacium, [Ibid. p. 1860. vol. III.]

ians, let the participation of the body and blood of the Lord be granted." And Haymo Halberstatensis saith, [x] "In the church believers every day eat his body and drink his blood."

AND this was the doctrine also of the church of Christ from the nine hundredth year of his incarnation to the time of the schoolmen, as we may see in [y] Bernard, [z] Fulbertus Carnotensis, [a] Theophylact, and [b] others, that lived within that time. But let these speak for the rest: Anselme; [c] "Whosoever, whether rich or mean or poor, whether clerk or layman, that shall eat this bread of the Lord and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." And Micrologus saith, [d] "That Gelasius writing to certain bishops, commanded him to be excommunicated, whosoever having received the body of Christ should abstain from partaking of the cup." And in Hugo de S. Victore, [e] "The Lord's supper is received in both kinds, to signify that the effect of this sacrament is double."

And though the schoolmen were the first that (as I can find) moved the question, whether it was lawful to receive the body of Christ without the blood; yet even amongst them several, if not most, holding with us, that both kinds ought to be administered, as [f] Lombard, Bandinus, [g] Alexander Alensis;

---

[x] Præsens ecclesia, in qua quotidie comedunt fideles ejus corpus et sanguinem bibunt. Haymo in Apocal. c. 2. [p. 25. b.]

[y] Bernard. serm. [3.] in ramis palm.

[z] Fulbert. Carnot. de tribus capitibus, [vol. III. sacr. bibl. s. patr. *Par.* 1589.]

[a] Theophylact. in 1 Cor. 11.

[b] V. Zachar. Chrysopol. l. 4. c. 156. Humbert. de Sylva candida, contra Græcorum calumnias. Petrum Cluniacens. contra Petrobrus. [p. 73.] Ivon. Carnot. decret. [par. 2.] Odon. Camer. in explic. sac. can. dist. 3. Guitmund. de veritate eucharistiæ, l. 1.

[c] Quicunque homo sive dives, sive mediocris, sive pauper, sive clericus, sive laicus, qui manducaverit panem Domini hunc, et biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini. Anselm. in 1 Cor. 11. [p. 183. vol. II. ed. 1573.]

[d] Unde et beatus Gelasius, in ordine quinquagesimus primus, scribens quibusdam episcopis, excommunicari præcepit quicunque sumpto corpore Dominico a calicis participatione se abstineret. Microl. de eccles. observat. c. 19. [vol. XVIII. Max. Bibl. Patr.]

[e] In utraque sumitur ad significandum, quod duplex est effectus hujus sacramenti. Hugo de S. Victore, spec. de myst. ecclesiæ, [p. 155. vol. III.] v. Nicet. p. 296.

[f] Lombard. 4. sent. dist. 11. [p. 231. par. IV.] Bandin. l. 4. dist. 11. [p. 367.]

[g] Alexand. Alens. p. 4.

and [h] others. And amongst the rest, Albertus Magnus saith expressly, [i] "Because the use of the faithful and the unity of the mystical body is not perfectly signified and caused, but only under a double sign; therefore in the virtue of the sacrament both ought to be had." And thus we see, how from our Saviour's time, for thirteen or fourteen hundred years together, the cup was administered as well as the bread to all: and therefore, we may well conclude, it ought to be denied to none.

---

[h] V. Durand. l. 4. rational. div. offic. c. 42. Richard. de Med. vill. [p. 146. vol. IV.] et Petrum de Tarant. 4. sent. dist. 11. Petrum de Palude, ibid. dist. 21. Biel. ibid. dist. 12.

[i] Quia non perfecte signatur, et causatur usus fidelium et unitas corporis mystici, nisi sub duplici signo; ideoque virtute sacramenti utrumque debet haberi. Albert Mag. 4. sent. dist. 8. [13.]

ARTICLE XXXI.

OF THE ONE OBLATION OF CHRIST FINISHED UPON THE CROSS.

The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption propitiation and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

WHAT we from the scripture call the Lord's supper the Papists from tradition think good to call the Mass or Missa, though they cannot agree about the etymology of the word[a], some deducing it from the Greek, [b]others from the Hebrew, but [c] others, and that more properly, from the Latin tongue. But howsoever they disagree in the word, they still agree in the thing, avouching that in this mass they offer up a [d] true and perfect sacrifice to God, [e] propitiatory for

---

[a] Quidam existimant esse vocem Græcam: ut Covarruias, [c. 4. l. 4. vol. I.] Suarez. in p. 3. Tho. disp. Genebrand saith it is Ἀπὸ τῆς μυήσεως, paucis mutatis, Liturg. c. 3; but this etymology is rejected by most of them as too far-fetched both for sense and sound.

[b] Nomen missa ex Hebraica vel Chaldaica nomenclatura acceptum esse videtur, quod enim in nostra vulgata legitur Deut. xvi. spontanea oblatio Hebraice ac Chaldaice dicitur Missah. Baron. in an. 34. n. 59. [vol. I.] Nec dictio missæ est nove, ut nonnulli aiunt, ficta, sed deducta olim ex Hebræo a patribus et Chaldæo Missach, Deut. xvi., quod oblationem spontaneam significat, Navar. Manual. c. 25. num. 111. [p. 246. vol. III.] But against this etymology they may note, 1. that the place they quote, Deut. xvi. 10. is otherwise expounded by the most ancient translations, Et facies solennitatem hebdomadarum Domino Deo tuo מסת נדבת ידך אשר תתן, sufficientiam spontis manus tuæ quod dabis, as Pagninus translates it; and so the LXX. Καθὼς ἡ χείρ σου ἰσχύει; and the Arabic also بيدك علي مقدار نيل, i. e. pro ratione vel mensura facultatis manus

---

tuæ. Syr. ܡܣܬ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܐܝ̈ܕܝܟ, pro modo separationis manuum tuarum, i. e. quantum manus tuæ separaverint: where we may observe how the Syriac retains the Hebrew word ܡܣܬ מסת. And therefore we may guess at the signification of the word in Hebrew by its use in Syriac. Now in the Syriac it plainly signifies sufficientia, as ܒܚܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܣܬܢ, cum usu sufficientiæ nostræ, 1 Tim. vi. 6. And according to these ancient translations, though our translators expounded it a *tribute* in the text, they put *sufficiency* into the margin. And according to this most ancient, and certainly truest exposition of the word, all the force of their argument from this place must needs fall. 2. Suppose, according to their vulgar translation, it should signify oblatio, yet it could not signify such an oblation as their missa is; for this, by their own acknowledgment, can be offered by none but the priest, whereas that was to be offered by the people. 3. If it should be an Hebrew word, how comes it about that the Hebrew, Greek, Syriac primitive churches, never made use of it, as any that is conversant amongst them cannot but observe, which is the argument that Bellarmine makes use of to prove it to be no Hebrew word: de miss. l. 1. c. 1.

[c] Missa dicitur quia missa est hostia, cujus commemoratio fit in illo officio, unde dicitur, Ite, missa est, i. e. Sequimini hostiam quæ missa est, ad cœlestia tendentes post eam. [Lombard.] Magist. sent. 4. dist. 24. [fin.] Dicitur missa quod cœlestis missus, i. e. angelus adveniat ad consecrandum, non ut consecret, sed ut sacerdoti consecranti assistat. Richard. de Med. vill. 4. sent. dist. 13. [p. 171. vol. IV.] and Bandin. dist. [13. p. 370.] Vel missa, ut Isidorus dicit, dicta est ab emittendo: tempore enim quo sacerdos incipit consecrare corpus Dominicum, dicendum est a diacono post evangelium: Si quis catechumenus est procedat foras: et quia tunc emittuntur catechumeni ab ecclesia, qui non debent interesse sacris mysteriis. Alcuin. de divin. offic. [c. 40. p. 1095.] Officium dividitur in missam catechumenorum et fidelium missam. Missa catechumenorum est ab introitu usque post offertorium: et dicitur missa ab emittendo; quia, tempore quo sacerdos incipit eucharistiam consecrare, catechumeni foras de ecclesia emittuntur. Missa fidelium est ab offertorio usque post communionem: et dicitur missa a dimittendo; quia tunc ad propria fidelis quisque dimittitur. Innocent. tert. de offic. missæ, l. 6. c. 12. And this is the most probable opinion, and the most received, as we may see, Bellarm. [vol. III.] de miss. l. 1. c. 1. Cassand. in consult. art. 24. de miss.

[d] Si quis dixerit in missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium; aut quod offerri non sit aliud, quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari, anathema sit. Concil. Trident. sess. 22. can. 1. [vol. X.] Catholici scriptores, qui hoc nostro seculo de sacrificio missæ scripserunt, omnes in eo potissimum laborant, ut ostendant, in missa offerri Deo vere ac proprie corpus ac sanguinem Domini, sub specie visibili panis et vini. Bellarm. [ibid.] de miss. l. 1. c. 5.

[e] Si quis dixerit missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non propitiatorium, vel soli prodesse sumenti, neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus,

the sins of the people, even as Christ did when he offered up himself to God as a propitiation for our sins. This, I say, is that which the church of Rome confidently affirms, and which our church in this article doth as confidently deny. And that,

First, because it is contrary to the scriptures; for the scriptures plainly hold forth Christ only as offering up himself, and that once for all; *for this he did once, when he offered up himself*, Heb. vii. 27. ix. 28. Whereas in the sacrifice of the mass they make as if the priest sacrificed Christ too, and that as often as himself sees good. The scriptures say that *by one offering Christ hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, Heb. x. 14; but according to this doctrine they are so far from being perfected by one offering, that they still need from day to day to have fresh offerings made for them.

Nay, and the scriptures say expressly that *without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins*, Heb. ix. 22; but according to this doctrine there is remission of sins without shedding of blood, themselves acknowledging there is no shedding of blood in this sacrifice, and yet averring sins are pardoned by it.

And as this doctrine is contrary to scripture, so is it repugnant to reason too, there being so vast a difference betwixt a sacrament and a sacrifice: for in a sacrament God offereth something to man, but in a sacrifice man offers something to God. [f] What is offered in a sacrifice is wholly or in part destroyed, but what is offered in a sacrament still remaineth. And there being so great a difference betwixt the one and the other, if it be a sacrament it is not a sacrifice, and if it be a sacrifice it is not a sacrament, it being impossible it should be both a sacrament and a sacrifice too. To which we might also add, that, according to this opinion, Christ offered up himself before he offered up himself; I mean he offered up himself in the sacrament before he

---

et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere, anathema sit. Concil. Trident. sess. 22. can. 3. [Ibid.]

[f] Ad verum sacrificium requiritur, ut id quod offertur Deo in sacrificium plane destruatur. Bellarm. de miss. l. 1. c. [2. ibid.]

offered up himself on the cross; which offering up himself in the sacrament was either a perfect or an imperfect sacrifice or oblation. To say that Christ should offer up an imperfect sacrifice to God is the next door to blasphemy; but yet a perfect one that sacrifice could not be, for then it need not have been repeated again upon the cross. But I need not heap up more arguments to pluck down that fabric, the foundation whereof is already destroyed. It is transubstantiation that is the ground of this fond opinion, therefore do they say the body of Christ is really offered up to God, because the bread is first really turned into the body of Christ; but now it being proved before that the bread is bread still after, as well as before consecration, and not the very body of Christ, though the bread be consecrated by man, the very body of Christ cannot be offered to God in the sacrament; and therefore, if they will still call it a sacrifice, they must acknowledge it is such a sacrifice wherein there is nothing but bread and wine offered to God, and by consequence no propitiatory sacrifice; for, as we have seen, *without shedding of blood there is no remission*, and in the breaking and pouring forth of bread and wine there is no shedding of blood, and not, therefore, any remission of sin.

But neither is this doctrine contrary to scripture and reason only, but to the Fathers also. Origen saith, [g] "Christ offered one only, and a perfect sacrifice, for which all these sacrifices went before in types and figures; the flesh of which sacrifice if any one touch he is presently sanctified, if he be unclean he is cleansed, if diseased he is cured." And if Christ offered but one, and that a perfect sacrifice, what need we any of the missatical sacrifices? And St. Chrysostome speaks plain: [h] "This therefore intimates to us the greatness of the sacrifice here spoken of, which being but one, and but once offered, was sufficient or able to do that which all the other could not:" so that the sacrifice of Christ was but once offered, either by himself or any one else.

---

[g] Sacrificium, pro quo hæc omnia sacrificia in typo et figura præcesserant, unum et perfectum immolatus est Christus. Hujus sacrificii carnem si quis tetigerit continuo sanctificatur, si immundus est mundatur, si in plaga est sanatur. Orig. in Lev. hom. 4. [8. vol. II.]

[h] Τοῦτο οὖν αἰνίττεται ἐνταῦθα τῆς θυσίας τὸ μεγάλειον, ἢ ἤρκεσε μία οὖσα, καὶ ἅπαξ προσενεχθεῖσα, τοσοῦτον ὅσον αἱ πᾶσαι οὐκ ἴσχυσαν. Chrysost. in Heb. hom. 13. [p. 503, 44. vol. IV.]

To this purpose makes that of Eusebius Emissenus: [i] "Because he was about to take his body from our eyes, and carry it up to heaven, it was needful that in the day of the supper he should consecrate for us the sacrament of his body and blood; that that might be continually worshipped by the mystery which was once offered for a price." And St. Augustine: [k] "Christ died once, the just for the unjust; death hath no more power over him; but lest you should forget what was once done, it is brought into our minds every year, as oft as the passover is celebrated. And is Christ slain so oft? No, but the anniversary commemoration of it representeth what was long ago done, and makes us to be moved so as if we saw the Lord present upon the cross." So that in the sacrament there is not any offering made by the priest, but only Christ's offering up himself once to God is here still represented and signified to us. And the same Father elsewhere: [l] "Wherefore Christians do still celebrate the memory of that sacrifice then made in the holy offering and participation of the body and blood of Christ." And St. Ambrose: [m] "The sacrifice effectual for our eternal salvation was once offered in Christ." And presently, [n] "What we do is done in commemoration of that which was then done, for, *Do this*, saith he, *in remembrance of me*." And therefore saith Lombard also, [o] "That that which is offered and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice or oblation, because it is the remembrance or representation of the true sacrifice upon the cross." And by this we may see in what sense the ancients called the eucharist a sacrifice; not as if it was a true or proper sacrifice itself, but only the commemoration or representation of that one and only true and proper sacrifice offered up by Christ himself: and so all the sacrifices of mass are at the best but dangerous deceits.

---

[i] Quia corpus assumptum ablaturus erat ab oculis nostris, et illaturus sideribus; necessarium erat ut die cœnæ sacramentum nobis corporis et sanguinis consecraret; ut coleretur jugiter per mysterium quod semel offerebatur in pretium. Euseb. Emissen. apud Gratian. de consecrat. dist. 2. can. Quia corpus, [p. 1887.]

[k] Semel Christus mortuus est justus pro injustis; &c. mors illi ultro non dominatur; tamen ne obliviscamini quod semel factum est, in memoria nostra fit; omni anno quoties pascha celebratur, nunquid toties Christus occiditur? Non, sed anniversaria recordatio repræsentat quod olim factum est, et sic nos facit moveri tanquam videamus præsentem Dominum in cruce. Aug. ibid. can. Semel Christus, p. [1897.]

[l] Unde jam Christiani, peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam celebrant, sacrosancta oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi. Aug. contra Faustum, l. 20. c. 18. [vol. VIII.]

[m] In Christo semel oblata est hostia ad salutem sempiternam potens. Gratian. can. In Christo, dist. 2. de consecr. ex Ambros. [p. 1898.]

[n] Quod nos facimus in commemorationem fit ejus quod factum est, Hoc enim facite, ait, in meam commemorationem. Ibid.

---

[o] Illud quod offertur et consecratur a sacerdote vocari sacrificium et oblationem, quia memoria est et repræsentatio veri sacrificii in ara crucis. Lomb. l. 4. dist. 12. [G.]

ARTICLE XXXII.

OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.

Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by God's law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

WHEN God had made man, he was pleased to make woman of him; and having made this woman of him, he joins her again unto him: he had no sooner made one but divides him into two; and he had no sooner divided him into two but he unites them into one again, making them man and wife, and so one flesh. And God having thus ordained marriage in the estate of innocency for the mutual society and comfort that one ought to have in the other, for the propagating their posterity, and so the peopling of the world, it seemed to be written in the law of nature, as well as instituted by the law of God; and therefore it was that in all ages, since the creation of the world, all sorts and degrees of men, of what nation and condition soever, have still been permitted by God, and desirous themselves, to enter this holy estate of matrimony; so that before and under the law, the priests, as well as the people, yea, the high priest himself, had this privilege expressly granted to him. And if we cast our eyes upon the gospel, we shall there find expressly delivered what is here in this article so plainly asserted, even that it is lawful for *bishops, priests, and deacons*, as well as for other men, *to marry at their own discretion.* For St. Paul saith expressly, *A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife,* 1 Tim.

iii. 2. So that a bishop may be blameless and yet married, blameless and yet the husband of one wife; [a] though to have more than one wife at one and the same time, as some of the Jews had, is here forbidden. But seeing to have more wives than one is here forbidden, to have one wife is plainly permitted. And again; *For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city as I have appointed thee. If any one be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children*, &c. Tit. i. 5, 6. So that here too a man, yea, one that is ordained, may be blameless, yet the husband of one wife; blameless, and yet have children; whence [b] both St. Chrysostome and Œcumenius observe, that the apostle here stops the mouths of those heretics that condemn marriage, shewing that it is not an unholy thing, but so honourable that a man with it may ascend the holy throne of episcopacy. And so concerning deacons the apostle saith, *Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well*, 1 Tim. iii. 12. And if they may be the husbands of one wife, it must needs be lawful for them to marry at their own discretion. To this purpose also makes that of the same apostle, *Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband*, 1 Cor. vii. 2. Now if every man may have his own wife, why not bishops, priests, and deacons, as well as others? Especially considering that *marriage is honourable in all*, Heb. xiii. 4; and if in all, then in ministers as well as others. Certainly the apostles themselves thought it honourable in themselves as well as others, otherwise themselves would not have been married men. St. Ambrose saith, [c] "All the apostles are said to have had wives, except St. John and St. Paul." But Ignatius, that [d] "Peter and Paul and other of the apostles were married." St. Basil, [e] "Peter and the other apostles." Clemens Alexandrinus saith, [f] "Peter and Philip begot children; and Philip gave his daughters to men in marriage: but Paul doth not stick in one epistle to make mention of his wife."

---

[a] *Δεῖ οὖν φησι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα· οὐ νομοθετῶν τοῦτό φησιν, ὡς μὴ εἶναι ἔξον ἄνευ τούτου γίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀμετρίαν κωλύων· ἐπειδὰν ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξῆν καὶ δευτέροις ὁμιλεῖν γάμοις καὶ δύο ἔχειν κατὰ ταυτὸν γυναῖκας.* Chrysost. in 1 Tim. hom. 10. [p. 285, 37. vol. IV.]

[b] *Τίνος ἕνεκεν καὶ τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰς μέσον παράγει; ἐπιστομίζει τοὺς αἱρετικοὺς τοὺς τὸν γάμον διαβάλλοντας, δεικνὺς ὅτι τὸ πρᾶγμα οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐναγὲς, ἀλλὰ οὕτω τίμιον, ὡς μετ' αὐτοῦ δύνασθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον ἀναβαίνειν θρόνον.* Chrysost. in epist. ad Tit. hom. 2. [p. 387, 14. vol. IV.] *τοὺς τὸν γάμον βδελυσσομένους αἱρετικοὺς ἐπιστομίζει, ὡς δυναμένους καὶ μετὰ γάμον ἐπισκοπῆς προνοεῖν τινός.* Œcum. in loc. [p. 289. vol. II.]

[c] Omnes apostoli, exceptis Johanne et Paulo, uxores habuisse di-

And as the apostles were most of them married men themselves, so do they decree, (supposing the canons attributed commonly to them to be really theirs, which of all the people in the world the papists, who are the sole oppugners of this truth, will not deny, I say, supposing this, the apostles themselves decreed,) saying, [g] "Let not a bishop, priest, or deacon put away his wife under the pretence of religion; and if any one do put her away, let him be excommunicated, and if he persevere, deposed." Upon which canon Zonaras saith, [h] "That if any one that is consecrated or ordained under pretence of religion shall put away his wife, let him be excommunicated; but if he continues not taking her again, let him be deposed also; for that seems to reproach or condemn marriage, as if copulation brought uncleanness, whereas the scripture calls it honourable, and the bed undefiled: but the canons mind us of some bishops then that had wives, for the bishops had not then the lawful conjunction with their wives forbidden.

---

cuntur. Ambros. in 2 Cor. ii. [2. vol. II.]

[d] *Εὔχομαι γὰρ ἄξιος Θεοῦ εὑρεθεὶς, πρὸς τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτῶν εὑρεθῆναι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, ὡς Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Ισαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακὼβ, ὡς Ἰωσὴφ, καὶ Ἰσαΐου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προφητῶν, ὡς Πέτρου, καὶ Παύλου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων, τῶν γάμοις προσομιλησάντων.* Ignat. epist. ad Philad. [p. 98.]

[e] *Ἐν δὲ τῇ νέᾳ διαθήκῃ, οἷος Πέτρος ἦν, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων.* Basil. de abdicat. rerum, [p. 371. vol. II.]

[f] *Πέτρος μὲν γὰρ καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαιδοποιήσαντο, Φίλιππος δὲ καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ἀνδράσιν ἐξέδωκεν· ὁ δὲ Παῦλος οὐκ ὀκνεῖ ἔν τινι ἐπιστολῇ τὴν αὐτοῦ προσαγορεῦσαι συζυγόν.* Clem. Strom. 3. [p. 535. vol. I.] cit. ab Euseb. hist. eccles. [p. 259. vol. I.] l. 3. *κεφ. λ.*

[g] *Ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα μὴ ἐκβαλέτω προφάσει εὐλαβείας· ἐὰν δὲ ἐκβαλῇ ἀφοριζέσθω· ἐπιμένων δὲ, καθαιρείσθω.* Can. apost. 5. [p. 235.]

[h] *Ὡς εἰ προφάσει εὐλαβείας ἱερωμένος τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ἀποπέμψηται, ἀφοριζέσθω, ἕως ἂν δηλαδὴ πεισθῇ προσλαβέσθαι αὐτήν· εἰ δὲ ἐπιμείνῃ μὴ προσλάμβανων αὐτὴν, καὶ καθαιρεθήσεται· ἔοικε γὰρ εἰς διαβολὴν εἶναι τοῦτο τοῦ γάμου, ὡς ἀκαθαρσίαν τῆς μίξεως ἐμποιούσης· τὸν δὲ τίμιον ἡ γραφὴ λέγει καὶ τὴν κοίτην ἀμίαντον· μέμνηται δὲ ὁ κανὼν καὶ ἐπισκόπων ἐχόντων γυναῖκας, ὅτι τότε ἀκώλυτον εἶχον καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τὴν πρὸς γυναῖκας νόμιμον συζυγίαν.* Zonar. in can. apost. 5. [ap. Bever. Synod. p. 4. vol. I.]

And Balsamon: [i] "Before the sixth general or Trullan council, it was lawful for bishops to have wives, even after their episcopal dignity, as the priests and deacons also that are ordained after marriage still have them." So that the apostles here plainly determined, that it was not only lawful for men in orders to have wives, but unlawful for them to put their wives away under pretence of religion.

And if we consult the primitive church in this particular, we shall find it following of the apostles' steps. It would be endless to number up the several passages we meet with in the Fathers, and the several examples of *bishops priests* and *deacons* we find to be married in the primitive church, which would help to confirm this truth now; but leaving both the judgments and examples of private men, we may bring many and famous councils that long ago subscribed to this truth. The council of Neocesarea: [k] "If the wife of any layman shall be manifestly convinced to have committed adultery, such a one cannot come into the ministry; or if she shall commit adultery after his ordination, he ought to put her away; but if he lives with her, he cannot perform the ministry committed to him." Where we may note, 1, that it is not a man's having a wife, but a man's wife's committing of adultery, that should debar him from the ministry; and, 2, that it is lawful for one that is ordained still to keep his wife, unless she have committed adultery, for it is only upon that account that this council decreed she should be put away. The council at Gangra: [l] "If any one shall separate himself from or judge concerning a priest that is married, as if when he offers or consecrates the sacrament he ought not to partake of the offering, let him be anathema;" [m] which canon, as Balsamon observes, pronounces a curse against all such as do not indifferently receive of priests that have wives, viz. that do not as well receive the sacrament of them that have wives as of them that have none; plainly implying, that it is as lawful for a married as for an unmarried priest to administer the sacraments, and by consequence to be in the ministry. The council of Anguri or Enguri: [n] "Whosoever, being ordained deacons, did at their ordination testify and say, they must needs marry, not being able to continue as they are; such after marrying are still to continue in the ministry, because they were permitted by the bishop;" and if a deacon may be continued in his ministry, though married, there is no reason that either bishop or priest should be cast out of the ministry because married, for the one is in holy orders as well as the other.

---

[i] *Πρὸ τῆς ϛʹ συνόδου τῆς ἐν τῷ Τρούλλῳ τοῦ παλατίου γενομένης, ἐξῆν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις ἔχειν γυναῖκας, καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐπισκοπικὸν ἀξίωμα, ὥσπερ ἔχουσι ταύτας καὶ οἱ μετὰ τὸν γάμον χειροτονούμενοι ἱερεῖς ἢ διάκονοι.* Balsam. ibid. [p. 3.]

[k] *Γυνή τινος μοιχευθεῖσα λαϊκοῦ ὄντος, ἐὰν ἐλεγχθῇ φανερῶς, ὁ τοιοῦτος εἰς ὑπηρεσίαν ἐλθεῖν οὐ δύναται· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν χειροτονίαν μοιχευθῇ, ὀφέλει ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν· ἐὰν δὲ συζῇ, οὐ δύναται ἔχεσθαι τῆς ἐγχειρισθείσης αὐτῷ ὑπηρεσίας.* Concil. Neocæs. can. 8. [p. 283. vol. I. Conc. Hard.]

[l] *Εἴ τις διακρίνοιτο παρὰ πρεσβυτέρου γεγαμηκότος, ὡς μὴ χρῆναι, λειτουργήσαντος αὐτοῦ προσφορὰς μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.* Concil. Gangr. can. 4. [p. 533. ibid.]

[m] *Ὁ παρὼν κανὼν ἀναθεματίζει τοὺς μὴ ἀδιστάκτως μεταλαμβάνοντας ἀπὸ ἱερέων ἐχόντων γυναῖκας.* Bal-

The Trullan council speaks also fully to the purpose, the thirteenth canon whereof begins thus: [o] "Forasmuch as we know that in the church of Rome it is delivered for a canon, that those which shall be thought worthy to be ordained deacons or presbyters shall profess that they will not be joined any more to their wives; we, following the old rule of the apostolical perfection and order, will that the lawful marriages or cohabitations of consecrated men with their wives be from henceforth confirmed, not dissolving their conjunction with their wives, nor depriving them of conversing with one another. But if any one be found worthy to be ordained a

---

sam. in loc. [p. 419. vol. I. Bever. Synod.]

[n] *Διάκονοι ὅσοι καθίστανται παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν κατάστασιν εἰ ἐμαρτύραντο καὶ ἔφασαν χρῆναι γαμῆσαι, μὴ δυνάμενοι οὕτω μένειν· οὗτοι μετὰ ταῦτα γαμήσαντες ἔστωσαν ἐν τῇ ὑπηρεσίᾳ διὰ τὸ ἐπιτραπῆναι αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.* Concil. Ancyr. can. 10. [p. 275. vol. I.]

[o] *Ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τάξει κανόνος παραδεδόσθαι διέγνωμεν, τοὺς μέλλοντας διακόνου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου χειροτονίας ἀξιοῦσθαι καθομολογεῖν, ὡς οὐκέτι ταῖς αὐτῶν συνάπτονται γαμεταῖς· ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἐξακολουθοῦντες κανόνι τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἀκριβείας καὶ τάξεως τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀνδρῶν κατὰ νόμους συνοικέσια καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐρρῶσθαι βουλόμεθα· μηδαμῶς αὐτῶν τὴν πρὸς γαμετὰς συνάφειαν διαλύοντες, ἢ ἀποστεροῦντες αὐτοὺς τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους κατὰ καιρὸν τὸν προσήκοντα ὁμιλίας· ὥστε εἴ τις ἄξιος εὑρεθείη πρὸς χειροτονίαν ὑποδιακόνου, ἢ διακόνου, ἢ πρεσβυτέρου, οὗτος μηδαμῶς κωλυέσθω ἐπὶ τοιοῦτον βαθμὸν ἐμβιβάζεσθαι, γαμετῇ συνοικῶν νομίμῳ· μήτε μὲν ἐν τῷ τῆς χειροτονίας καιρῷ ἀπαιτείσθω ὁμολογεῖν, ὡς ἀποστήσεται τῆς νομίμου πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν γαμετὴν ὁμιλίας.* Concil. Trul. can. 13. [p. 1665. vol. III.]

subdeacon, deacon, or priest, let such a one by no means be forbidden to ascend that degree, because he dwelleth with his lawful wife. Neither let it be exacted of any one at the time of his ordination, that he profess that he will abstain from the lawful conversation with his own wife." And presently: [p] "If any one therefore, being stirred up against the apostolical canons, shall dare to deprive any of those in their orders, we mean priests and deacons, of their conjunction and communion with their lawful wives, let him be deposed."

To which we may also add that canon of the fifth council at Carthage, cited in this canon of the Trullan council, decreeing, [q] That sub-deacons handling the holy mysteries, and deacons, and priests, (yea, and bishops too, as it is in the Carthaginian council itself, though not mentioned in the Trullan quotation of it,) do, in their proper turns, abstain even from their consorts. So that they were commanded to abstain from their wives when their course came to minister, as both [r] Balsamon and [s] Zonaras explain the canon, but not to be cast from their ministry because they had wives.

To these we may add that of the council at Angiers, [t] "Let none but such men as are the husbands of one wife only, and are joined to virgins, be ordained deacons or priests." Such as had more wives than one, according to the apostle's rule, might not be ordained, but such as are the husbands of one may. And the first council at Toledo, [u] "It pleaseth us that deacons, if they be sound and chaste, and of a continent life, may be placed in the ministry, although they have wives." So that their marriage was no hinderance to their ministerial function.

---

[p] *Εἴ τις οὖν τολμήσοι παρὰ τοὺς ἀποστολικοὺς κανόνας κινούμενος, τινὰς τῶν ἱερωμένων, πρεσβυτέρων φαμὲν, ἢ διακόνων, ἀποστερεῖν τῆς πρὸς τὴν νόμιμον γυναῖκα συναφείας τε καὶ κοινωνίας, καθαιρείσθω.* Ibid.

[q] *Ἴσμεν δὲ ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἐν* Καρ*θαγένῃ συνελθόντες τῆς ἐν βίῳ σεμνότητος τῶν λειτουργῶν τιθέμενοι πρόνοιαν ἔφασαν, ὥστε τοὺς ὑποδιακόνους τοὺς τὰ ἱερὰ μυστήρια ψηλαφῶντας, καὶ τοὺς διακόνους ἢ πρεσβυτέρους κατὰ τοὺς ἰδίους ὅρους καὶ ἐκ τῶν συμβίων ἐγκρατεύεσθαι.* Ibid. [et vid. c. 25. eccl. Afr. p. 877. vol. I.]

[r] Προσ*τιθέασι δὲ μὴ ἔχειν τούτους τὴν μετὰ τῶν ὁμοζύγων αὐτῶν συνάφειαν ἀδιάφορον. ἀλλ' ἀποδιΐστασθαι τούτων, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐφημερίας αὐτῶν, ἤγουν καθ' οὓς ἱερουργοῦσι καιρούς.* Balsam. in concil. Trul. can. 13. [Bever. Synod. p. 171. vol. I.]

[s] *Ἔστι δὲ εἰπεῖν ὅτι οὐχ ἁπλῶς τοῦτο φάσιν ἀλλὰ τὸν καιρὸν μόνον τῆς ἱερουργίας καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἱερᾶς ὑπηρεσίας ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν γαμετῶν αὐτῶν βούλονται τούτους.* Zon.

[t] Non nisi unius uxoris viri, iidemque virginibus copulati, diaconi vel presbyteri ordinentur. Concil. Andegav. c. [11. p. 780. vol. II. Hard. conc.]

[u] Placuit ut diaconos, si vel integri et casti sint et continentis vitæ, etiamsi uxores habeant, in ministerio constituantur. Concil. Tolet. 1. cap. 1. [p. 990. vol. I.]

But the most remarkable passage is that of Paphnutius in the council of Nice, recorded by [w] Socrates, [x] Sozomen, [y] Gelasius Cyzicenus, [z] Nicephorus, and others. The relation which Socrates gives of it is this: [a] "And let so much," saith he, "suffice to be spoken concerning that one thing of Paphnutius. But now I will declare what came to pass, by the means of his counsel, to the benefit of the church and the ornament of those that are ordained. It seemed good to the bishops (in the council of Nice) to bring a new law into the church, that those that are consecrated, I mean bishops, priests, and deacons, should not lie with their wives which they married when laymen. And they having propounded to consult about that matter, Paphnutius, standing up in the midst of the assembly, spake aloud, that so heavy a yoke should not be laid upon consecrated persons, saying, that the bed is honourable and marriage undefiled; that they must have a care lest they injure the church by too great severity, for all cannot bear the exercise of so much freeness from passion, neither could the continency of every man's wife be so well preserved: but the use of a man's lawful wife he called continency or chastity: but it is enough that they that come into the clergy do not marry according to the ancient tradition of the church: but that they should not be separated from those which before when laymen they had married. And this he said, having himself never touched a wife, nor scarce a woman; for from a child he was brought up in a monastery, and for his continency was as famous as any. The whole assembly of sacred persons assented to the words of Paphnutius, and therefore they ceased from any further inquiry into this business, leaving every one to his liberty whether he will abstain from his wife or no. And so much concerning Paphnutius." So far Socrates. From whence we may observe how this most renowned council that ever was since our Saviour's time, assenting to Paphnutius's words, or, as Sozomen expresseth it, [b] "approving of his counsel," acknowledged that marriage was as lawful, and the bed as undefiled, and the use of their lawful wives an act of continency and chastity even in bishops, priests, and deacons, of whom he only spake, as well as in any others; from whence it must needs follow, that it is as lawful for them as any others to marry.

---

[w] Socrat. l. 1. c. [11.]

[x] Soz. l. 1. c. [23.]

[y] Gelas. Cyz. act. concil. Nic. l. 2. c. 33. [p. 438. vol. I.]

[z] Niceph. l. 8. c. 19. [vol. I.]

[a] Ἓν μὲν οὖν τοῦτο περὶ Παφνουτίου εἰρήσθω· ὃ δὲ πρὸς λυσιτέλειαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ κόσμον τῶν ἱερωμένων διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ συμβολὴν γέγονε, διηγήσομαι. Ἐδόκει τοῖς ἐπισκόποις νόμον νεαρὸν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰσφέρειν, ὥς τε τοὺς ἱερωμένους, λέγω δὲ ἐπισκόπους, καὶ πρεσβυτέρους, καὶ διακόνους, μὴ συγκαθεύδειν ταῖς γαμεταῖς, ἃς ἔτι λαϊκοὶ ὄντες ἠγάγοντο. Καὶ ἐπεὶ περὶ τούτου βουλεύεσθαι προὔκειτο, διαναστὰς ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ συλλόγου τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὁ Παφνούτιος, ἐβόα μακρὰ, μὴ βαρὴν ζύγον ἐπιθεῖναι τοῖς ἱερωμένοις ἀνδράσι· τίμιον εἶναι καὶ τὴν κοιτὴν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀμίαντον τὸν γάμον λέγων, μὴ τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῆς ἀκριβείας, μᾶλλον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν προσβλάψωσιν· οὐ γὰρ πάντας δύνασθαι φέρειν τῆς ἀπαθείας τὴν ἄσκησιν, οὐδὲ ἴσως φυλαχθήσεσθαι τὴν σωφροσύνην τῆς ἑκάστου γαμετῆς· σωφροσύνην δὲ ἐκάλει καὶ τῆς νομίμου γυναικὸς τὴν συνέλευσιν· ἀρκεῖσθαι τὲ τὸν φθάσαντα κλήρου τυχεῖν, μηκέτι ἐπὶ γάμον ἔρχεσθαι κατὰ τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀρχαίαν παράδοσιν· μὴ μὲν ἀποζεύγνυσθαι ταύτης, ἣν ἅπαξ ἤδη πρότερον λαϊκὸς ὢν ἠγάγετο· καὶ ταῦτ' ἔλεγεν ἄπειρος ὢν γάμου, καὶ ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν, γυναικός· ἐκ παιδὸς γὰρ ἐν ἀσκητηρίῳ ἀνετέθραπτο· καὶ ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ, εἴ καί τις ἄλλος, ὢν περιβόητος· πείθεται πᾶς ὁ τῶν ἱερωμένων σύλλογος τοῖς Παφνουτίου λόγοις· διὸ καὶ τὴν περὶ τούτου ζήτησιν ἀπεσίγησαν, τῇ γνώμῃ τῶν βουλομένων ἀπέχεσθαι τῆς ὁμιλίας τῶν γαμετῶν καταλείψαντες· καὶ τοσαῦτα μὲν περὶ Παφνουτίου. Socrat. hist. eccles. l. 1. c. [11.]

And thus we see how the primitive church still acknowledged the truth of this doctrine, neither do we read it much opposed by any but the church of Rome and her complices. The first that set himself against it was pope [c] Siricius, after him Innocent the First, [d] John the Thirteenth, Leo the Ninth, and others; but the most implacable enemy was [e] Gregory the Seventh or pope Hildebrand, about the year 1073; [f] about which time also it began to be prohibited here in England; after him [g] Calixtus the Second, [h] Alexander the Third, and others of the same rank; and as one of them succeeded another in the see of Rome, so still one excelled another in inveighing against this sacred truth, till at the length they are now come to that height as not to be ashamed to say, [i] "That it is a greater sin for a priest to marry, than for him to commit fornication or adultery;" as if the pope strove to make good the apostle's saying of himself, *Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God*, 2 Thess. ii. 4. God indeed hath forbidden to commit adultery, but the pope hath forbidden priests to marry, and therefore it must needs be a greater sin to marry than to commit adultery; for in that they transgress the command of the pope, whereas in this they only transgress the command of God; and what is, if this be not, to oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God? making it a greater sin to transgress his edicts, than the great God's most sacred precepts. But let us not wonder at the propagation of this doctrine, for it is no more

---

[b] *'Επήνεσε δὲ καὶ ἡ σύνοδος τὴν βουλὴν, καὶ περὶ τούτου οὐδὲν ἐνομοθέτησεν.* Sozom. hist. l. 1. c. [23.]

[c] Siric. pap. epist. ad Himer. [VII. p. 849. vol. I. Hard. conc.]

[d] Polydor. Virgil. hist. Angl. l. 6. [p. 119.]

[e] V. Aventin. annal. l. 5. [p. 460.] Lambert. Schafnaburg. in chronic. ad an. 1074. [p. 157, b.] Sigebert. Gemblac. chronic. ad eund. annum, [p. 449.] Vincent. hist. tom. IV. l. 25. c. 45.

[f] Whilst Gregory the VIIth was pope of Rome, Lanfranc was primate of England; in whose days there was a council assembled at Winchester, wherein, as the acts of the said council shew, Decretum est, ut nullus canonicus uxorem habeat, sacerdotes vero in castellis et in vicis habitantes habentes uxores non cogantur ut dimittant; non habentes interdicantur ut habeant. Et deinceps caveant episcopi, ut sacerdotes et diaconos non præsumant

ordinare, nisi profiteantur ut uxores non habeant. Concil. Winton. [p. 1559. par. i. vol. VI.] From which it appears, that the celibacy of priests did but begin at this time here in England to be commanded, and none were as yet forced to put away their wives but such as were canonici, even such as belonged to cathedral churches, they that lived in towns and villages were still permitted to keep theirs, though he also went further than any had done before. For though in the days of king Edgar, an. 964, Odo and Dunstan, archbishops of Canterbury, Oswold of York, and Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester, and others, did endeavour it, yet there was never any law or decree made against the marriage of priests till this of Lanfranc, though this also permitted some to keep their wives. But not long after him, Anselm being got into the chair, he assembled a council at London, an. 1102, where it was decreed, Ut nullus archidiaconus, presbyter, diaconus, canonicus uxorem ducat, aut ductam retineat, [p. 1864. par. ii. vol. VI.] and presently, Ut nullus ad subdiaconatum aut supra ordinetur sine professione castitatis: which being more than ever was done before, Henry Huntington saith expressly, Eodem anno ad Festum Michaelis tenuit Anselmus archiepiscopus concilium apud Londonias, in quo prohibuit sacerdotibus Anglorum uxores antea non prohibitas. Henric. Huntingt. de hist. Anglor. l. 7. [p. 378.]

[g] Calixt. sec. apud Gratian. dist. 27. [p. 131. Decr. Grat.] v. et Mat. Par. in Henr. I. [p. 58.]

[h] Decretal. l. 3. tit. 3. De clericis conjugatis, [p. 923. Decr. Greg.]

[i] Sacerdos si fornicetur aut domi concubinam foveat, tametsi gravi sacrilegio se obstringat, gravius tamen peccat si matrimonium contrahat. Coster. enchirid. c. de cœlibatu sacerd. propos. 9. [p. 528.] Gretser. hist. ord. Jesuit. [p. 115.]

than what was long ago foretold; for *the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their consciences seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats,* 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3; so that this doctrine they stand so stiff for, it is but the doctrine of devils, which we who desire still to stand fast to the doctrine of God dare not but deny, and conclude that no one should be forbidden to marry, but that even bishops, priests, and deacons may marry at their discretion, as well as other Christian men.

ARTICLE XXXIII.

OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW THEY ARE TO BE AVOIDED.

That person which by open denunciation of the church is *rightly cut off from the unity of the church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an heathen and publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the church by a judge that hath authority thereto.*

THE exercise of ecclesiastical discipline is as necessary for the right ordering of the church, as the execution of civil laws is for the governing of the state. I know it is the doctrine revealed in the gospel that is as the soul of the church, whereby it is quickened; but it is the discipline commanded in the gospel that is as the nerves and sinews, whereby the members of the church are tied together, and every one kept in its proper place; and hence it is that Christ hath settled the discipline that is to be exercised, as well as revealed the doctrine that is to be believed by his church; and the principal exercise of this church discipline consisteth in excommunication, that is, in the casting out from the public prayers, sacraments, and the communion of the faithful members of the church, all such as *cause divisions and offences*, Rom. xvi. 17; *blasphemers*, 1 Tim. i. 20; *heretics*, Tit. iii. 10; *all fornicators, covetous, idolaters, railers, drunkards, extortioners*, 1 Cor. v. 11; *all incestuous persons*, v. 1; *yea, all such as neglect the admonition and discipline of the church,* Matt. xviii. 15, 16, 17. So that if a man be excommunicated for a lighter offence than some think should be punished with such severity, yet if afterwards he shall slight and contemn his excommunication, and not at all matter nor seek to have it taken off, his contemning his being excommunicated is a sufficient ground wherefore he should stand excommunicated. And all that are excommunicated for any of these or the like offences are to continue under the same punishment, until they have manifested the sincerity of their repentance and sorrow for their sins, by public confession of them, and contrition for them; after which, [a] as it was long ago determined in the first council of Orange, they are to be received into the church and the communion of the faithful again; of which we have spoken more, art. XVI: and thus, by the power of the keys, heaven-gate is both shut to sinners and opened again to penitents.

But until they be thus openly reconciled to the church, our Saviour commands they should be to us as heathens and publicans, Matth. xviii. 17; and well they may, for when once excommunicated they have no more right to any church-membership than the heathens and publicans have; and therefore St. Paul commands us to avoid them, Rom. xvi. 17; not to keep company, no, not to eat with them, 1 Cor. v. 11; to put away from amongst us such wicked persons, v. 13; and St. John, not to receive them into our houses, nor bid them God speed, 2 John 10; so that when once they are excommunicated from Christ's church, we are not to have any communion with their persons.

And truly, should it not be so, excommunication would signify nothing; for therefore is it called excommunication, because by it they are cast out of all communion with the faithful.

---

[a] Cum aliquis excommunicatus vel anathematizatus pœnitentia ductus veniam postulat et emendationem promittit, episcopus qui eum excommunicavit ante januas ecclesiæ venire debet, &c.; deinde interroget episcopus si pœnitentiam juxta quod canones præcipiunt pro perpetratis sceleribus suscipere velit. Et si ille terræ prostratus veniam postulat, culpam confitetur, pœnitentiam implorat et de futuris cautelam spondet, tunc episcopus apprehensa manu ejus dextra in ecclesiam illum introducat et ei communionem et societatem Christianam reddat. Concil. Arausic. I. reconcil. excommunicat. [p. 280. vol. VII. Concil. *Par.* 1644.]

And if we consider the end of the exercise of this power, we should find it exercised in vain, unless this article be observed. The principal ends wherefore it is exercised are, first, that the person so excommunicated *may be ashamed of his sin*, 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15, and he is *delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord*, 1 Cor. v. 5. Every one that is excommunicated is delivered unto Satan, for he is cast out of the church, where Satan reigns, as Christ within it. And the end of it is, that he may be brought to shame and confusion for his sin, and so turn to the Lord. So that it is exercised for the correction, not the destruction, [b] for the cure, not the death of souls. But, if they be no more avoided after than they were before excommunication, the sting of the punishment is taken out, and it would become in a manner no punishment nor correction at all. Secondly, notorious sinners and heretics are cast out of the church, [c] lest such as are in it should be corrupted by them, as the apostle himself intimates, when he, speaking of excommunicating the incestuous persons, addeth, *Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?* 1 Cor. v. 6; whereas, if such persons as are excommunicated should be conversed with, this end of their excommunication would be altogether frustrated, and the discipline itself superfluous; for *evil communications* would still *corrupt good manners*, 1 Cor. xv. 33. And these therefore being the principal ends of excommunication, (together with the awe such punishments should strike into others, lest they should be guilty of the like sins,) as we cannot but wonder at the practice of such as excommunicate persons when they be dead, as we find the first African council did Genimus Victor, so we cannot but condemn the practice of those that do not endeavour to avoid

[b] Cum excommunicatio sit medicinalis, non mortalis, disciplinans, non eradicans, dum tamen in quem lata fuerit, non contemnat; caute provideat judex ecclesiasticus, ut in ea ferenda ostendat se prosequi quod corrigentis est et medentis. Concil. Lugdun. I. decret. 12. [p. 405. vol. VII. conc. Hard.]

[c] *Τοῦτο καὶ ποιμένες ποιοῦσι, τὰ ψώρας ἐμπεπλησμένα πρόβατα τῶν ὑγιαινόντων ἀπείργουσιν, ἵνα ἀποθέμενα τὴν ἀρρωστίαν, μετ᾽ ἀσφαλείας πρὸς τὰ ὑγιαίνοντα ἐπανέλθῃ πάλιν, καὶ μὴ νοσοῦντα τὴν ἀγέλην ἅπασαν ἐμπλήσῃ τῆς ἀρρωστίας ἐκείνης.* Chrysost. orat. in David et Saul, 3. tom. V. p. 89. [33.]

excommunicate persons, as heathens and publicans, until they be received again into the church.

Neither let any one think this is a new coined doctrine, for it was Gregory the Great's council long ago, [d] "But such as are suspended from ecclesiastical communion, let no religious person be joined to, according to the commands of the canons." And truly there are many canons of the primitive church that command this: as, the tenth canon attributed to the apostles, [e] "If any one shall pray with him that is excommunicated, let him be also excommunicated." The council at Antioch, [f] "It is not lawful to communicate with such as are excommunicated, nor to go from house to house to pray with such as do not pray in the church, nor for such to be received in one church as do not assemble in another. But if any bishop, priest, or deacon shall be found to communicate with those that are excommunicated, let him be also excommunicated, as one that confounds the order of the church." The third, or, as some think, the fourth, council at Carthage: [g] "Whosoever shall communicate or pray with one that is excommunicated, whether he be a clergy or a layman, let him be excommunicated." The first council at Toledo: [h] "If any layman be excommunicated, let no clergyman nor any religious person go to him or his house; and so likewise a clergyman, if he be excommunicated, let him be avoided by the clergy; but if any one shall be taken talking or eating with him, let him also be excommunicated." The council at Auxerre: [i] "It is not lawful to communicate with one that is excommunicated, nor to eat meat with him." And presently: [k] "If any priest, or any of the clergy or of the people, shall knowingly receive one that is excommunicated, without the consent of him that excommunicated him, or shall eat bread with him, or appoint to talk with him, he shall have the like sentence passed upon him." And the second Lateran council: [l] "But whosoever shall presume knowingly to communicate with one that is excommunicated, before he be absolved by him that excommunicated him, let him be held liable to the same sentence." And thus I find the council of Sardice too, (in their synodical letters to all the bishops in the world recorded by Theodoret,) counselling them [m] that they command that none communicate with the Arians, whom they had excommunicated.

---

[d] Eis vero qui ab ecclesiastica communione suspensi sunt nullus religiosus secundum canonum præcepta jungatur. Greg. epist. l. [4. ep. 27. vol. II.] ad Januarium.

[e] Εἴ τις ἀκοινωνήτῳ κἂν ἐν οἴκῳ συνεύξηται οὗτος ἀφοριζέσθω. Can. apost. 10. [Bever. Synod. vol. I.]

[f] Μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς ἀκοινωνήτοις, μηδὲ κατ᾽ οἴκους συνελθόντας συνεύχεσθαι τοῖς μὴ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ συνευχομένοις, μηδὲ ἐν ἑτέρᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑποδέχεσθαι τοὺς ἐν ἑτέρᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ μὴ συναγομένους· εἰ δὲ φανείη τις τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων ἢ διακόνων ἤ τις τοῦ κανόνος τοῖς ἀκοινώνητοις κοινωνῶν καὶ τοῦτον ἀκοινώνητον εἶναι ὡς ἂν συγχέοντα τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Concil. Antioch. can. 2. [p. 593. vol. I.]; citat. et a concil. Tribur. cap. 2. [p. 439. par. i. vol. VI.]

[g] Qui communicaverit vel oraverit cum excommunicato, sive clericus sive laicus, excommunicetur. Concil. Carthag. 3. can. 73. [p. 983. Ibid.]

[h] Si quis laicus abstinetur, ad hunc vel ad domum ejus vel clericorum vel religiosorum nullus accedat. Similiter et clericus si abstinetur a clericis devitetur. Si quis autem illo colloqui aut convivari fuerit apprehensus etiam ipse abstineatur. Concil. Tolet. 1. c. 15. [p. 991. vol. I. Hard.]

To these we might also add the many canons of the primitive church forbidding such as are excommunicated by one to be received into communion by another: as the famous council at Nice; [n] "Concerning those that are excommunicated, whether of the clergy or lay order, let this sentence, according to rule, be observed by the bishops of all provinces, commanding that they that are cast out by one be not received by others." The same was also decreed in several other councils: as [o] in the council of Arles, and [p] others; and among the rest it was decreed in an ancient council in London, [q] "Let no one presume to receive into communion him that is excommunicated by another: which if any one shall knowingly do, let him be also deprived of Christian communion. All which being put together, we may well conclude, that excommunicate persons, so long as excommunicate, ought to be avoided.

---

[i] Non licet cum excommunicato communicare, vel cum eo cibum sumere. Concil. Antisiodor. c. 38. [p. 446. vol. III. Ibid.]

[k] Si quis presbyter aut quilibet de clero aut de populo excommunicatum absque voluntate ipsius, qui eum excommunicavit, sciens receperit, aut cum illo panem manducaverit, vel colloquium habere decreverit, simili sententiæ subjacebit. Ibid. can. 39.

[l] Qui vero excommunicato, antequam ab eo qui eum excommunicaverit absolvatur, scienter communicare præsumpserit, pari sententiæ teneatur obnoxius. Concil. Lateran. 2. can. 3. [p. 1208. vol. VI. par. ii.]

[m] Τούτοις μηδένα κοινωνεῖν παραγγείλατε· οὐδεμία γὰρ κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος· τούτους πάντες μακρὰν ποιεῖτε. Apud Theodoret. hist. eccles. l. 2. c. [6. p. 595. vol. III.]

[n] Περὶ τῶν ἀκοινωνήτων γενομένων, εἴτε τῶν ἐν κλήρῳ, εἴτε τῶν λαϊκῷ τάγματι, ὑπὸ τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπων, κρατείτω ἡ γνώμη κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν διαγορεύοντα τοὺς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθέντας, ὑφ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσίεσθαι. Concil. Nicen. can. 5. [p. 323. vol. I.]

[o] Concil. Arelat. 2. can. 8. [p. 773. vol. II.]

[p] Concil. Antioch. can. 6. [p. 595. vol. I. Conc. Hard.] Concil. Turon. 2. c. 8. [p. 359. vol. III.] v. et Concil. Arausic. 1. c. 11. [p. 1785. vol. I.] Concil. Paris. 3. c. 7. [p. 338. vol. III.] Concil. Lateran. 1. can. 9. [p. 1112. vol. VI.] Carthag. 2. al. ult. c. 7. [p. 952. vol. I.]

---

[q] Nemo excommunicatum alterius præsumat in communionem suscipere: quod si scienter fecerit, et ipse communione careat Christiana. Concil. Londinens. an. 1125. [cap. xi. p. 1126. par. ii. vol. VI.]

ARTICLE XXXIV.

OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH.

It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like,) as he that offendeth against the common order of the church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

WHAT the great God would have punctually observed in his worship, himself hath been pleased expressly to command in his word; so that nothing is to be looked upon as part of his worship but what himself hath commanded, and whatsoever himself hath commanded is necessarily to be observed as part of his worship. But there being many circumstances required to the performance as well of religious as civil actions, and so to the worship of God as well as any thing else; as, for example, the time when, the place where, the habit in which his public service shall be performed, and the like, it being impossible it should be performed without these and the like circumstances; and seeing the all-wise God hath thought good not to determine these in his word, but to leave it to the discretion of the church to determine them as it shall see fit, only giving them this general rule to square all these their determinations by, *Let all things be done decently and in order;* hence it is that every particular church hath still thought fit to exercise this her power and authority, in determining these circumstances, according to that manner as seemeth to herself orderly and devout: so that there is no necessity that one church should determine them after the same manner that another doth; nay, it is often necessary that one church should not follow another in this case; for it often so falls out that what is decent in one place is unseemly in another, and every church is bound to model circumstances according to that order which is the most seemly and decent in the place where it is settled. And hence we find how St. Paul, and after him Clemens Romanus, in [a] his epistle to the Corinthians, having shewn in general that all things should be done in all places *decently and in order;* hence, I say, we find how the primitive churches still much differed in this their determination of the particular circumstances of divine worship, as, amongst many other things, we may see in particular in the time of the celebration of Easter; which being but a mere circumstance, every one followed the tradition and custom of the church wherein he lived, in the celebration of it. [b] Some churches celebrated it upon the fourteenth day of the first month, (as the Jews did the Passover,) let it fall upon what day of the week it would; [c] others only upon the Lord's day on which he arose: and thus they differed in this ceremony, until at the length they agreed on all sides to celebrate it upon one and the same day; of which more presently. But thus we see (not to instance in any more ceremonies, plenty whereof might easily be produced) how the churches of Christ that immediately succeeded the apostles themselves, did not think it necessary to observe one and the same time in the celebration of the feast, but every particular church followed still the tradition of their ancestors that lived in the same place, not minding whether it was agreeable to the traditions received by other churches or no.

---

[a] *Προδήλων οὖν ἡμῖν ὄντων τούτων, καὶ ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως, πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν, ὅσα ὁ δεσπότης ἐπιτελεῖν ἐκέλευσεν· κατὰ καιροὺς τεταγμένους τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, καὶ οὐκ εἰκῆ ἢ ἀτάκτως ἐκέλευσεν γίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὡρισμένοις καιροῖς καὶ ὥραις.* Clem. epist. ad Corinth. p. 52. *οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν, εὐπρόσδεκτοί τε καὶ μακάριοι.* Ibid. p. 53.

[b] *Ζητήσεως δῆτα κατὰ τούσδε οὐ σμικρᾶς ἀνακινηθείσης, ὅτι δὴ τῆς Ἀσίας ἅπασαι αἱ παροικίαι ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀρχαιοτέρας σελήνης τὴν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην ᾤοντο δεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα ἑορτῆς παραφυλάττειν, ἐν ᾗ θύειν τὸ πρόβατον Ἰουδαίοις προηγόρευτο.* Euseb. hist. l. 5. c. [23. vol. II.] And Polycrates having reckoned up St. Philip, St. John, Polycarp, Papirius, Melito, and others, in his epistle to the church of Rome, adds, *οὗτοι πάντες ἐτήρησαν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης τοῦ πάσχα κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.* Polycrat. ad eccles. Rom. apud Euseb. l. 5. c. [24. Ibid.]

I know, indeed, that the bishop of Rome (Victor by name) was a busybody, meddling with more than he should have done then, as well as now, and therefore must needs be excommunicating all churches that did not follow his custom and tradition; [d] but, as Eusebius relates it, his doings "did not please all the bishops:" and amongst others Irenæus himself sent a reproving letter to him, telling him [e] "he should not cut off whole churches of God, for keeping a tradition of ancient custom." As if he should have said, It is not so necessary that they should use the same tradition and circumstance of time as we do; let them follow their tradition, and we ours. And for the conviction of the bishop of Rome of his error, he produceth two stories, both which make for our purpose; the one is, how the presbyters that were before Victor in Rome, Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, and Sixtus, though they did not follow the Asian tradition in celebrating this feast on the fourteenth day of the month; [f] yet notwithstanding they still agreed with the bishops of those churches wherein it was so observed when they came unto them; [g] "and that for the different manner of the observation of the feast none ever were cast out, but the presbyters before thee, that did not observe it so, yet sent the eucharist to those that did." So that they did not think that one church should be tied to the observance of the same traditions that are in another, but that every church should in such things be left to their own liberty. The other story is that concerning Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, that followed the Asian tradition, and Anicetus, bishop of Rome, that followed the Roman: for these two being met, [h] "and having discoursed together about other things, were presently agreed, not falling out about this business." And though Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp to follow the Roman, nor Polycarp Anicetus to follow the Asian tradition, [i] yet for all that they communicated together, and parted from one another in peace, all churches having peace amongst themselves, whether they did or did not observe the Passover after the same manner or tradition: from whence we may gather, that in those purer times it was not looked upon as necessary that traditions and ceremonies should be one and the same in all places, but that every church might follow its own traditions.

---

[c] *Οὐκ ἔθους ὄντος τοῦτον ἐπιτελεῖν τὸν τρόπον ταῖς ἀνὰ τὴν λοιπὴν ἅπασαν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησίαις, ἐξ ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως τὸ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο κρατῆσαν ἔθος φυλαττούσαις, ὡς μὴ δ' ἑτέρᾳ προσήκειν παρὰ τὴν τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἡμέραν τὰς νηστείας ἐπιλύεσθαι.* Ibid. c. [23.]

[d] *Ἀλλ' οὐ πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐπισκόποις ταῦτ' ἠρέσκετο.* Ibid. c. 24.

[e] *Ὡς μὴ ἀποκόπτοι ὅλας ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ, ἀρχαίου ἔθους παράδοσιν ἐπιτηρούσας.* Ibid.

[f] *Οὐδὲν ἔλαττον αὐτοὶ μὴ τηροῦντες εἰρήνευον τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν ἐν αἷς ἐτηρεῖτο ἐρχομένοις πρὸς αὐτούς.* Ibid.

[g] *Καὶ οὐδέποτε διὰ τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο*

And truly, if we consider the nature of traditions and ceremonies, we must needs grant it is not necessary they should be one and the same in all places; for in that they are mere traditions and ceremonies, they are things of indifferency, which may be done or left undone, and still without sin; and so in themselves there is no necessity of their being observed in any place or at any time whatsoever, for that would argue them to be more than mere ceremonies and traditions; and if it be not absolutely necessary they should be observed in any place, it cannot be necessary they should be one and the same in all places. What God hath commanded in his word is obligatory to all churches whatsoever, but what is not commanded in the scriptures (as traditions and ceremonies, in

---

ἀπεβλήθησαν τινὲς, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτοὶ μὴ τηροῦντες οἱ πρὸ σοῦ πρεσβύτεροι τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν τηροῦσιν ἔπεμπον εὐχαριστίαν. Ibid.

[h] *Καὶ περὶ ἄλλων τινῶν μικρὰ σχόντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους εὐθὺς, εἰρήνευσαν, περὶ τούτου τοῦ κεφαλαίου μὴ φιλεριστήσαντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς.* Ibid.

[i] *Καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων ἐκοινώνησαν ἑαυτοῖς,* &c. *καὶ μετ᾽ εἰρήνης ἀπ᾽ ἀλλήλων ἀπηλλάγησαν, πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰρήνην ἐχόντων τῶν τηρούντων, καὶ μὴ τηρούντων.* Ibid.

that they are traditions and ceremonies, are not) is left to the prudential disposition of particular churches to enjoin or not enjoin them: and when they do enjoin them, they cannot enjoin them as things in themselves necessary, but only as necessarily to be observed in reference to the more orderly government of the church, as to the place and time then being. But though it be only lawful, not necessary, that any particular ceremonies should be enjoined, yet, when once enjoined, it is not only lawful, but necessary they should be observed, not because the ceremonies that are enjoined in themselves are necessarily to be observed, but because the power that doth enjoin them is necessarily to be obeyed. It is true the ceremonies and traditions are but traditions and ceremonies after as well as before they were enjoined, and so in themselves still indifferent, so that they may be done or not done without sin, as to any obligatory power seated in their own nature. But when once enjoined there comes an extrinsical obligation to them, binding all within the church that doth enjoin them to the faithful observation of them; so that though as ceremonies and traditions they are still indifferent in themselves, yet, being enjoined by lawful authority, they are not indifferent as to our use and practice, but we are bound to use them, not because ceremonies, but because enjoined, and because of him who hath commanded us *to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake*, 1 Pet. ii. 13: though it be not ordained by God, and therefore indifferent in itself, yet if it be ordained by men it is necessary as to our use, who are bound to submit to every ordinance of man, even as for the Lord's sake, and *to be subject to the higher powers*, Rom. xiii. 1; and therefore we must needs acknowledge, that *whosoever through his private judgment willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the word of God*, (as if mere traditions and ceremonies they are not,) *and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, that others may fear to do the like:* and that for these three reasons: first, because he offendeth against the common order of the church: God hath commanded that all things in his church should be done decently and in order, but such a person breaks this the order of the church, and therefore ought certainly to be reproved. Secondly, he hurteth the authority of the magistrate, whom God hath commanded us to obey; and in what things are we to obey him in, if not in things of indifferency, as ceremonies and traditions all are? Lastly, he wounds the consciences also of the weak brethren, and so causeth schisms and divisions and offences in the church; and all that do so the apostle commands us to avoid, Rom. xvi. 17.

And certainly, if we consult the Fathers, they will tell us it is every one's duty not to break but observe the several traditions and ceremonies, which, being not repugnant to the word of God, are enjoined by common authority in the church he lives in. [k] "The question therefore," saith St. Basil to Amphilochius, "concerning the Cathari hath before been spoken to, and thou well mindedst and admonishedst, that the custom of every region is to be observed." And St. Augustine excellently: [l] "But other things, which are changed according to the several places and regions of the earth, as for example, that some fast upon the sabbath day, others do not, &c., and the like such kind of things, have a free observation; neither is there any better discipline in these things to a grave and prudent Christian, than to do so as he sees the church to do unto which he shall chance to come; for whatsoever is enjoined, neither contrary to faith nor good manners, is indifferently to be accounted of, and to be observed and kept for their society amongst whom he lives." And presently he brings us an excellent passage which he had from St. Ambrose when discoursing with him: [m] "When I come to Rome," saith St. Ambrose, "I fast upon the sabbath day; when I am here, I do not fast; and so thou, whatsoever church thou shalt chance to come to, keep and observe her way and manners in such things, if thou wouldest not be a scandal to others, nor have any one else to be so to thee." And then he (St. Augustine) adds, [n] "But I, thinking of this sentence again and again, esteemed it as if I had received it from a heavenly oracle." And afterwards, [o] "Let therefore every one do what he finds in the church to which he comes." And the same Father elsewhere, [p] "For in these things, concerning which the holy scripture hath determined nothing certain, the custom of the people of God and the institutions of our ancestors or betters are to be taken for a law."

---

[k] Τὸ *μὲν οὖν περὶ τοὺς καθαροὺς ζήτημα καὶ εἴρηται πρότερον, καὶ καλῶς ἀπεμνημόνευσας, ὅτι δεῖ τῷ ἔθει τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην χώραν ἕπεσθαι.* Basil. ad Amphiloch. can. I. [vol. III.]

[l] Alia vero quæ per loca terrarum regionesque variantur, sicuti est quod alii jejunant sabbatho, alii vero non, &c. Et si quid aliud hujusmodi animadverti potest, totum hoc genus rerum liberas habet observationes, nec disciplina ulla est in his melior gravi prudentique Christiano, quam ut eo modo agat, quo agere viderit ecclesiam ad quamcunque forte devenerit. Quod enim neque contra fidem, neque contra bonos mores injungitur, indifferenter est habendum, et pro eorum inter quos vivitur societate servandum est. Aug. epist. [54. 2. vol. II.] ad Januarium. v. et Isidor. Hispal. de eccles. offic. l. I. c. 39.

[m] Cum Romam venio jejuno sabbato; cum hic non jejuno; sic

To this purpose also saith the council of Florence, [q] "That every one should observe the rites or customs of his own church, which it is not lawful for any one to change by his private authority." And long before this, the famous council at Nice decreed, that [r] "ancient customs should prevail, or be observed." So that the customs and ceremonies which we have received by tradition from our forefathers, not being repugnant to the word of God, are still to be followed and observed by us, especially when approved and ordained by lawful authority. And therefore the fourth council at Orleans determined it, saying, [s] "Whatsoever this holy synod by the help of God hath appointed, we decree that that holy definition be ob-

---

etiam tu ad quam forte ecclesiam veneris, ejus morem serva, si cuiquam non vis esse scandalo, nec quemquam tibi. Aug. ibid. [3.]

[n] Ego vero de hac sententia etiam atque etiam cogitans ita semper habui tanquam eam cœlesti oraculo susceperim. Ibid.

[o] Faciat ergo quisquam quod in ea ecclesia in quam venit invenerit. Ibid. [6.]

[p] In his enim rebus de quibus nihil certi statuit scriptura divina, mos populi Dei vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt. Id. epist. [36. 2. vol. II.] ad Casulan.

[q] Unusquisque ritum ecclesiæ suæ servare deberet quem privata autoritate mutare non licet. Concil. Florent.

[r] Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω. Concil. Nicen. can. 6. [vol. I. Bev. Synod.]

[s] Quapropter auxiliante Domino quæ synodus sancta constituit, decernimus, ut a cunctis fratribus hæc definitio sancta conservetur. Quod si quisque salubriter perspicit instituta indecenter transgredi quacunque occasione tentaverit, noverit se Deo et cunctæ fraternitati culpabilem esse futurum, quia justum est per unitatem antistitum ut ecclesiastica fulgeat disciplina et inconvulsa maneat constitutio sacerdotum. Concil. Aurel. 4. can. [38. p. 1441. vol. II. Conc. Hard.]

served by all the brethren." But if any one shall be found to transgress unseemly these wholesome institutions, let him know that he will be faulty towards God and the whole brotherhood, because it is just that by the unity of the governors ecclesiastical discipline should flourish, and that the constitutions of the priests should remain unshaken." But the council of Carthage was sharper; for having ordained several ceremonies, traditions, and ecclesiastical constitutions, adds, [t]"But if any one by transgressing them shall violate or corrupt these statutes or constitutions, or shall think they are to be accounted of as nothing, if he be a layman, let him be deprived of his communion, if a clergyman, of his honour:" so severe was the primitive church against all such as violated the traditions or ceremonies commanded and ordained by lawful authority. And therefore we do but follow their steps in saying they ought openly to be rebuked.

Every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

That the church in general hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, we have before proved, Art. XX.; that the same power is granted to every national church in particular, we have here asserted: and truly if the church in general as a church be acknowledged to have such a power, every particular church, in that it is a church also, cannot be denied it. So that as the universal church, gathered together in an œcumenical council, may ordain and decree rites and ceremonies to be observed, not only by particular, but by the universal church, so have all provincial or particular churches power to decree rites and ceremonies for themselves, though not for the universal church, nor yet for other particular churches. And therefore did our reformers of ever blessed memory, giving the reasons why they abolished some ceremonies and retained others, profess, saying, [u] "In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe any thing but to our own people only." But though any particular or provincial church cannot prescribe ceremonies for other churches, yet it may for itself; and if it may decree and ordain some, it must needs follow that it may also change and abolish others; and indeed it is often necessary it should do so, as in particular before our reformation, when as our reformers, in the place before cited, observe, "ceremonies were so far abused, partly by the superstitious blindness of the rude and unlearned, and partly by the unsatiable avarice of such as sought more their own lucre than the glory of God, that the abuses could not well be taken away, the thing still remaining." So that it is often necessary, when ceremonies are abused, not only to take off the abuses, but to abolish the ceremonies. I say it is often, yet not always so necessary; for in some ceremonies the abuses may be so taken off as the ceremonies may still be retained without the abuses. And in such cases, though it may seem better to abolish them, yet in St. Augustine's judgment it is better to retain them rather than to bring in new ones which at the first may seem to be preferred before them; and the reason he gives is, [x] "Because the change of a custom, though it may help by its utility, yet it hurts by its novelty." And this was the reason why in our reformation some were still retained as well as others abolished.

---

[t] Si quis vero statuta supergressus corruperit vel pro nihilo habenda putaverit, si laicus est communione, si clericus honore privetur. Concil. Carthag. I. can. 14. [p. 688. vol. I.]

And thus we find Hezekiah long ago did. *He removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brasen serpent that Moses made,* 2 Reg. xviii. 4; and thus he abolished many of those things which the people abused. But did he abolish them all? No; *The high places which were before Jerusalem, which were on the right hand of the mount of corruption, which Solomon the king of Israel had builded for Ashtoreth the abomination of the Zidonians, and for Chemosh the abomination of the Moabites, and for Milcom the*

---

[u] In the preface to our public liturgy, Of ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained.

[x] Ipsa quippe mutatio consuetudinis etiam quæ adjuvat utilitate, novitate perturbat. Aug. epist. [54. 6. vol. II.] ad Januarium.

abomination of the children of Ammon, the altar at Bethel, and the high places which Jeroboam had made, these he did not abolish, for we find them in Josiah's reign, 2 Reg. xxiii. 13, 14, who began to reign fifty-seven years after Hezekiah died. These things it seems he hoped to have taken off the abuses from, and to have put them to good uses, and therefore he retains them, though he abolished the others of which he had no such hopes.

And that every church hath such a power to ordain, alter, and abolish what ceremonies she pleaseth, that are but mere ceremonies, neither commanded nor forbidden in the word of God, is either supposed or granted in the words of the apostle to the Corinthians, *Let all things be done to edifying*, 1 Cor. xiv. 26; and, *Let all things be done decently and in order*, v. 40. For the church of Corinth, to which he sends these orders, was but a provincial or particular church, and yet he sends to them to see that *things should be done decently and in order*; which either supposeth that before he sent unto them they had power to determine and ordain what was thus edifying and orderly, or if they had no such power before, yet these words must needs invest them with it. And if the church of Corinth had this power, there is no reason that other particular churches should be denied it.

And if we take a view of the customs of the primitive churches, we shall find that they still looked upon themselves as endowed with such authority, otherwise they would never have exercised it so often as they did. For we can scarce ever find any of the primitive churches gathered together in council, but still they ordain or change or abolish, or both ordain, change, and abolish some, if not several ceremonies; yea, and the first provincial councils that ever met together, as we read of since the apostles' time, assembled upon no other account than to determine and ordain a ceremony, even when the feast of Easter should be celebrated; "For this cause," saith Eusebius, [y]"councils and assemblies of bishops were gathered together, and all of them with one consent signified by their letters to all bishops every where their ecclesiastical constitution, to wit, that the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord be not celebrated upon any other than the Lord's day, and that upon that day only the fasts which were kept about the Passover should be ended." For this cause the provincial churches of Palestina, of Rome, of Pontus, of France, of Osroena, all met together in several provincial councils, and as the same author relates it, [z]"many others, which being all of one opinion and judgment, ordained the same thing, even that the feast should be kept upon the Lord's day." In the mean while there was another council in Asia[a], over which Polycrates (not pope Victor, nor his legates) was president, which decreed that it should be kept upon the fourteenth day of the month, be it what day it would. Neither was the controversy ever ended till all the provincial churches met together in the general council of Nice, and there decided it, that it should be kept only upon the Lord's day. But thus we see how the five first provincial churches we ever read of, that met together after the apostles' times, exercised this power and authority of decreeing ceremonies and traditions.

---

[y] Σύνοδοι δὴ καὶ συγκροτήσεις ἐπισκόπων ἐπὶ ταὐτὸν ἐγίνοντο· πάντες τε μιᾷ γνώμῃ δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν δόγμα τοῖς πανταχόσε διετυποῦντο, ὡς ἂν μὴ δ' ἄλλῃ πότε τῆς κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ τὸ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως ἀποτελοῖτο τοῦ κυρίου μυστήριον, καὶ ὅπως ἐν ταύτῃ μόνῃ

And if we should descend down to after councils, we shall find there was scarce ever a provincial church met together in council since our Saviour's time, but did ordain some ceremonies or other to be observed by her children. It would be an endless thing to reckon up all the ceremonies that were ordained or altered by provincial churches; or indeed all the provincial churches that ordained or altered ceremonies in the primitive times. I shall therefore instance only in such ceremonies as our church hath thought good still to retain, that so we may see both how provincial churches have still looked upon themselves in all ages to have power to ordain ceremonies, and also, that the cere-

---

τῶν κατὰ τὸ πάσχα νηστειῶν φυλαττοίμεθα τὰς ἐπιλύσεις. Euseb. hist. eccles. l. 5. c. [23.]

[z] Καὶ πλείστων ὅσων ἄλλων οἱ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν δόξαν καὶ κρίσιν ἐξενηνεγμένοι τὴν αὐτὴν τέθεινται ψῆφον. Ibid. [ad fin.]

[a] Τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐπισκόπων τὸ πάλαι πρότερον αὐτοῖς παραδοθὲν διαφυλάττειν ἔθος χρῆναι διϊσχυριζομένων ἡγεῖτο Πολυκράτης. Ibid. c. [24. init.]

monies retained and ordained by our church are no newfangled ceremonies nor popish superstitions, but that most of them were ordained and used in the primitive church before the pope had forged his superstitions.

The provincial church or council of Gerundia therefore ordained, [b] "That every church should use one order in divine service." The provincial church at Narbonne decreed, [c] "That in the orders of singing, at the end of every psalm, glory be given to the Almighty God, (viz. 'Glory be to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,') but in greater psalms, according to their length, shall be made several pauses, and at every pause the glory of the Trinity be sung to the Lord." And the third council at Toledo, [d] "Whosoever doth not say, 'Glory be to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' let him be anathema:" and this is the hymn of glorification or doxology, [e] "which," St. Basil saith, "they received in his time by tradition from their ancestors, who also followed the scriptures in it." But the fourth council at Toledo made some alteration in this tradition, ordaining, [f] "That in the end of psalms it should not be said, 'Glory be to the Father,' but 'Glory and honour to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' the prophet David saying, *Give to the Lord glory and honour*, &c. This observation therefore," say they, "we give to all ecclesiastical persons, which whosoever shall neglect shall be excommunicated." And as for what is said still after the doxology, (viz. "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be,") the Vasionian council doth not only ordain it should be then said, but gives the reason of it: [g] "Because," say they, "not only in the apostolical seat, but also through all the east, and all Africa and Italy, by reason of the cunning of the heretics, whereby they blasphemously used to say, that 'the Son of God was not always with the Father, but began to be in time,' for this reason, after 'Glory be to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' was said, 'As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end,' we also have decreed that it shall be so said in all our churches." And the same provincial church also ordained, that [h] "*Kyrie eleeson*, or 'Lord have mercy upon us,' should be often repeated in their divine service."

---

[b] Unaquæque ecclesia in officio unum ordinem teneat. Concil. Gerund. c. 1. [tit. p. 1043. vol. II.]

[c] Ut in Psallendi ordinibus per quemque psalmum gloria dicatur omnipotenti Deo: per majores vero psalmos, prout fuerint prolixius, pausationes fiant, et per quamque pausationem gloria Trinitatis Domino decantetur. Concil. Narbon. can. 2. [p. 492. vol. III.]

[d] Quicunque non dixerit Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto anathema sit. Concil. Tolet. 3. [14. p. 475. vol. III.]

[e] *Ὅπερ ἔλεγον τοίνυν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν καὶ ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὅτι ἡ δόξα κοινὴ πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ, διὸ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν δοξολογίαν προσάγομεν τῷ πατρί· ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτο ὑμῖν ἐξαρκεῖ, ὅτι τῶν πατερῶν ἡ παράδοσις· κἀκεῖνοι γὰρ τῷ βουλήματι τῆς γραφῆς ἠκολούθησαν.* Basil. de Spirit. S. c. 7. [p. 305. vol. II.]

[f] In fine psalmorum, non sicut a quibusdam hucusque, Gloria Patri, sed Gloria et honor Patri dicatur, David propheta dicente *Afferte Domino gloriam et honorem*, &c. Universis ergo ecclesiasticis hanc observantiam damus; quam quisquis præterierit communionis jacturam habebit. Concil. Tolet. 4. c. [15. p. 584. vol. III.]

The provincial council at Bracarum ordained, [i] "that bishops should not salute the people one way and presbyters another, but both one and the same way, saying, *The Lord be with you*, as it is read in the book of Ruth, and that the people should answer, 'And with thy spirit,' as all the eastern church also retain it, as delivered by tradition from the apostles themselves, and not as the Priscillian pravity hath changed it." And the third council at Toledo, that [k] "According to the form of the oriental churches, the Constantinopolitan creed should still be repeated and published before the Lord's Prayer be said, that the true faith may be made manifest and acknowledged."

---

[g] Quia non solum in sede apostolica, sed et per totum orientem et totam Africam vel Italiam, propter hæreticorum astutiam, qua Dei Filium non semper cum Patre fuisse sed in tempore cœpisse blasphemant, in omnibus clausulis post Gloria Patri, &c. sicut erat in principio, &c. dicatur, etiam et nos universis ecclesiis nostris ita dicendum esse decernimus. Concil. Vasens. [ii.] can. 5. [p. 1106. vol. II.]

[h] Et quia tam in sede apostolica quam per totas orientis atque Italiæ provincias dulcis et nimis salubris consuetudo intromissa est, ut Kyrie eleison frequentius cum grandi affectu ac compunctione dicatur, placuit etiam et nobis, ut in omnibus ecclesiis nostris ita consuetudo sancta et ad matutinum et ad missas et ad vesperam Deo propitiante intromittatur. Ibid. can. 3.

[i] Ut non aliter episcopi, aliter presbyteri populum, sed uno modo salutent, dicentes, Dominus sit vobiscum; sicut in libro Ruth legitur; et ut respondeatur a populo, Et cum spiritu tuo; sicut et ab ipsis apostolis traditum omnis retinet oriens, et non sicut Priscilliana pravitas permutavit. Concil. Bracar. 1. cap. 3. [p. 350. vol. III.]

[k] Petitione Reccaredi regis constituit synodus, ut per omnes ecclesias Hispaniæ et Galliciæ, secundum formam ecclesiarum orientalium, concilii Constantinopolitani, hoc est 150 episcoporum symbolum fidei recitetur; et priusquam dominica dicatur oratio, clara voce prædicetur, quo fides vera manifesta sit et testimonium habeat. Concil. Tolet. 3. can. 2. [p. 479. ibid.]

The [fourth] council at Carthage decreed, [l] "that the deacon should be clothed with white only in the time of offering and reading." And the third council at Tours ordained, that [m] "laymen, if they did no oftener, at the least three times a year they should communicate, unless any one be by chance hindered by some greater crimes." And the council at Agde names the same three times of the year when every one is to communicate, which our liturgy hath appointed, decreeing, that [n] "Secular persons or laymen, that do not communicate at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, let them not be believed to be catholic or orthodox persons, nor reckoned among such as are catholic." And so did the Elibertine or Eliberitane council too, as cited by Gratian: [o] "Neither is any one numbered among the orthodox who at these three times, viz. Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, doth not communicate."

The second synod at Cabilone decreed, that [p] "confirmation should not be repeated, nor baptism;" and so the council at Tarraco in Spain, [q] "We hear say that some of the common people are confirmed by the same bishops twice or thrice, or oftener, the bishops themselves knowing nothing of it; wherefore it seemeth good to us, that neither confirmation nor baptism ought to be repeated at all." So that our church is not the first that hath decreed any thing about confirmation. The council at Laodicea decreed, [r] that "neither weddings nor birthdays should be kept or celebrated in Lent."

---

[l] Ut diaconus tempore oblationis tantum vel lectionis alba induatur. Concil. Carthag. 4. can. 41. [p. 981. vol. I.]

[m] Ut si non frequentius vel ter laici homines in anno communicent, nisi forte quis majoribus quibuslibet criminibus impediatur. Concil. Turon. 3. c. 50. [p. 1030. vol. IV.]

[n] Seculares qui in natali Domini, pascha, et pentecoste non communicaverint catholici non credantur, nec inter catholicos habeantur. Concil. Agath. c. 18. [p. 1000. vol. II.]

[o] Nec inter catholicos connumeratur qui in istis viz. temporibus, pascha, pentecoste et natali Domini non communicaverit. Concil. Elib. apud Grat. de consecr. dist. 2. c. Omnis homo, [p. 1881. Decret. Grat.]

[p] Unde nobis visum est eandem confirmationem sicut nec baptismum iterari minime debere. Concil. Cabil. 2. c. 27. [p. 1036. vol. IV.]

[q] Concil. Tarrac. apud Grat. de consecr. d. 5. c. Dictum est, [p. 1992. Decret. Grat.]

[r] Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν τεσσαρακοστῇ γάμους ἢ γενέθλια ἐπιτελεῖν. Concil. Laodic. can. 52. [p. 789. vol. I.]

And an ancient council here in England, kept under Theodorus, ordained, that [s] "Easter should be kept in common by all upon the Sunday after the fourteenth moon of the first month." And another at Oxford decreed, [t] "That every bishop shall require an oath from him which shall be presented to him, that for that presentation he hath neither promised nor given any thing to him that presented him, nor hath entered any contract for it;" and the same council, [u] "That due honour may be given to divine duties, we command, that they that minister at the altar have their surplices on," as the third council at Carthage before did. The fourth council at Toledo decreed, [x] "That the Song of the three children should be constantly sung in divine service."

And thus we see how many even of the very rites and ceremonies, which are still in use amongst us, were long ago ordained by provincial churches met together in council; many more I might heap up to the same purpose, but these may be enough to shew how the provincial or national churches of Christ, in all ages since his incarnation, have still exercised this power in ordaining, altering, and abolishing ceremonies, which certainly they would never have done, if they had not believed they had power to do it.

---

[s] Ut sanctum diem paschæ in communi omnes servemus dominica post decimam quartam lunam primi mensis. Concil. Anglican. an. [673.] cap. 1. [Wilk. conc. Brit. p. 42. vol. I.]

[t] Præsenti quoque statuto definimus, ut episcopus ab eo qui sibi præsentatus fuerit recipiat juramentum, quod propter præsentationem illam non promiserit nec dederit aliquid præsentanti, nec aliquod propter hoc pactum inierit. Concil. Oxon. c. [17. p. 119. vol. VII. Conc. Hard.]

[u] Ut honor debitus divinis officiis impendatur, præcipimus ut qui altari ministrant suppeliciis induantur. Ibid. c. [10. p. 118.]

[x] Hymnum quoque trium puerorum, in quo universa cœli terræque creatura Deum collaudat, et quem ecclesia catholica per totum orbem diffusa celebrat, quidam sacerdotes in missa dominicorum dierum, et in solennitatibus martyrum canere negligunt. Proinde sanctum concilium instituit, ut per omnes Hispaniæ ecclesias vel Galliciæ in omnium missarum solennitate idem in publico decantetur, communionem amissuri qui antiquam hujus hymni consuetudinem nostramque definitionem excesserint. Concil. Tolet. 4. c. [14. p. 584. vol. III.]

ARTICLE XXXV.

OF HOMILIES.

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.

OF THE NAMES OF THE HOMILIES.

1. Of the right use of the church.
2. Against peril of idolatry.
3. Of repairing and keeping clean of churches.
4. Of good works: first of fasting.
5. Against gluttony and drunkenness.
6. Against excess of apparel.
7. Of prayer.
8. Of the place and time of prayer.
9. That common prayers and sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue.
10. Of the reverend estimation of God's word.
11. Of almsdoing.
12. Of the nativity of Christ.
13. Of the passion of Christ.
14. Of the resurrection of Christ.
15. Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.
16. Of the gifts of the Holy Ghost.
17. For the rogation days.
18. Of the state of matrimony.
19. Of repentance.
20. Against idleness.
21. Against rebellion.

To run through every particular homily here mentioned, and to confirm every particular expression therein contained, would not only swell this into many of the like volumes, but take up more time also than either I or any one else (that hath no more time than one age to live) can have to do it in;

and when all is done it would still be but a superfluous and needless work too; for it is not so much the homilies themselves that are to be read, as the reading of these homilies in public assemblies, that is the thing carped at; so that the principal thing here to be confirmed is, that it is lawful even in public meetings, where the people of God are assembled to perform service and worship to him, to read other books, discourses, sermons, or homilies, (for a homily and a sermon is all one,) than what is expressly and word for word contained in the holy scriptures. And to prove this from scripture, I might instance in the words of St. Paul to the Colossians, *And when this epistle is read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans,* [a] *and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea,* Coloss. iv. 16. Here we see St. Paul charges the Colossians to read the epistle from Laodicea; what epistle? not any of the epistle of St. Paul's to the Laodiceans, but rather the epistle of the Laodiceans to St. Paul. [b] "Some," saith Theodoret, "have thought that St. Paul also wrote to the Laodiceans, and therefore they produce also a feigned epistle; but St. Paul doth not say the epistle which was to the Laodiceans, but that which was from Laodicea: for they had written concerning certain things to him." And St. Chrysostom, [c] "Some say that he doth not understand any epistle of St. Paul sent to them, but one sent from them to St. Paul: for he did not say the epistle written to the Laodiceans, but he said, that written from Laodicea." And therefore St. Justinian, [d] "The opinion of Chrysostom and Theodoret seems to me to be the nearest the truth, even that not St. Paul's epistle to the Laodiceans, but rather the Laodiceans' epistle to St. Paul is here signified, which the Greek words plainly shew." So that here the Holy Ghost doth not only permit them, but command them to read a discourse which was not any part of the canonical scriptures. For though perhaps it might be some epistle written by St. Paul from Laodicea, yet it is plain, that it is not any part of the holy scriptures, unless we hold that some part of the holy scriptures is lost; which no wise man will; and therefore we cannot but from hence grant it to be lawful, even in the church, to read some things which are no part of the canon of scriptures.

---

[a] The vulgar Latin renders it here, Et eam quæ Laodicensium est vos quoque legatis, whereas the Greek hath it expressly, Καὶ *τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε,* and therefore the Syriac ܘܗܝ ܕܐܬܟܬܒܬ ܡܢ ܠܐܕܝܩܝܐ ܩܪܘܗ ܐܢܬܘܢ, i. e. *And that which was written from Laodicea do you also read,* which being the true and genuine exposition of the words, it is not any epistle of St. Paul written to the Laodiceans that can be here understood; nor indeed, though we should admit of the vulgar Latin to give us the right translation of the words, can there be any such consequence, but rather the quite contrary, drawn from them. For suppose it be Laodicensium epistola, that doth not imply St. Paul's Epistle to them, but rather the Laodiceans' to him, and therefore it is called the Laodiceans', not St. Paul's Epistle.

[b] Quidam existimant ipsum etiam scripsisse ad Laodicenses: itaque fictam etiam epistolam proferunt. Divinus autem apostolus non dixit eam quæ est ad Laodicenses, sed eam quæ est a Laodicæa; illi enim de aliquibus rebus ad illum scripserant. Theodoret. in loc. [p. 363. vol. III.]

[c] *Τινὲς λέγουσιν ὅτι οὐχὶ τὴν Παύλου πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀπεσταλμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν παρ' αὐτῶν Παύλῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἶπε τὴν πρὸς Λαοδικέας ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας φησί.* Chrysost. in Colos. hom. 12. [p. 152. vol. IV.]

And if we call to mind the practice of the primitive church, we shall find that even then many things were read in the church besides canonical scriptures, yea, and ordered to be read by councils. The [third] council of Carthage decreed indeed, [e] "That nothing should be read in the church besides the canonical scripture under the name of holy scriptures:" but in decreeing that, they imply that something else may be read in the church, though not under the name of holy scriptures; and therefore themselves add too presently, [f] "The passions of the martyrs may also be read when their anniversary days are celebrated." And the council at Vasiona or Vasens, [g] "This also pleaseth us, for the edification of all churches and the profit of all people, that we give power to priests to preach the word, not only in cities, but in all parishes. So that if the priest, some infirmity hindering him, cannot preach himself, the homilies of the holy fathers be read or recited by the deacons." And so the council at Rhemes ordained, [h] "That bishops study to preach, according to the property of the language, the sermons and homilies of the holy fathers, so that all may understand them." So that it is no new thing for homilies to be ordained to be read in churches. And if we still ascend higher, we shall find that presently after our Saviour's time there were several things read in the churches besides canonical scripture; especially there are three writings which I find then to be read in public, Hermas's Pastor, Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, and Clemens's Epistle to the Corinthians.

---

[d] Chrysostomi et Theodoreti sententia mihi vero propinquior visa est. Non Pauli epistolam ad Laodicenses, sed contra potius Laodicensium ad Paulum significari quod Græca verba aperte indicant. Justinian. in loc. [p. 363. vol. II.]

[e] Item placuit, ut præter scripturas canonicas, nihil in ecclesia legatur sub nomine divinarum scripturarum. Concil. Carthag. 3. c. 47. [p. 968. vol. I. Conc. Hard.]

[f] Liceat etiam legi passiones martyrum, cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrantur. Ibid.

[g] Hoc etiam pro ædificatione omnium ecclesiarum et pro utilitate totius populi nobis placuit, ut non solum in civitatibus, sed etiam in omnibus parochiis verbum faciendi daremus presbyteris potestatem; ita ut si presbyter, aliqua infirmitate prohibente, per seipsum non potuerit prædicare, sanctorum patrum

First for Hermas's Pastor, of which Eusebius Cæsariensis saith, [i] "But because the same apostle, at the end of his Epistle to the Romans, makes mention with others of one Hermas also, whose the book of the Pastor they say is, we must know that that also is gainsaid by some by whom it is not put amongst the acknowledged books of the scriptures, yet by others it is judged very necessary, especially for such as are to be instructed in the first elements; whereupon we know that it is read publicly in the churches." And St. Jerome, [k] "Hermas, of whom the apostle Paul writing to the Romans makes mention, saying, *Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon,*

---

homiliæ a diaconibus recitentur. Concil. Vasens. 2. can. 2. [p. 1105. vol. II.]

[h] Ut episcopi sermones et homilias sanctorum patrum, sicut omnes intelligere possent, secundum proprietatem linguæ prædicare studeant. Concil. Rhem. [2.] c. 15. [p. 1019. vol. IV.]

[i] Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐν ταῖς ἐπὶ τέλει προσρήσεσι τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, μνήμην πεποίηται μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ Ἑρμᾶ, οὗ φασὶν ὑπάρχειν τὸ τοῦ ποιμένος βιβλίον, ἰστέον ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς μὲν τινῶν ἀντιλέλεκται, δι' οὓς οὐκ ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις τεθείη, ὑφ' ἑτέρων δὲ ἀναγκαιότατον οἷς μάλιστα στοιχειώσεως εἰσαγωγικῆς κέκριται· ὅθεν ἤδη καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίαις ἴσμεν αὐτὸ δεδημοσιευμένον. Euseb. hist. l. 3. c. 3.

[k] Hermas, cujus apostolus Paulus ad Romanos scribens meminit, *Salutate Asyncritum, Phlegonem, Hermam, Patrobum, Hermen et qui cum eis fratres sunt.* Asserunt autorem esse libri qui appellatur Pastor, et apud quasdam Græciæ ecclesias etiam publice legitur. Hieron. in catalog. scriptor. eccles. [p. 831. vol. II.]

Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren which are with them, (Rom. xvi. 14.) they say he was the author of the book which is called the Pastor, and in some churches of Greece it is read publicly;" and therefore saith Ruffinus, [l] "Of that order (viz. of ecclesiastical, not canonical books) is the book of Tobit and Judith, and the books of the Maccabees, but in the New Testament the book which is called the book of the Pastor, or Hermas; all which they (the ancient Fathers) would have to be read in the churches, but not produced to confirm the authority of faith out of them." So that it is manifest that this book, though not canonical scripture, was read publicly in the primitive churches.

The next is Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, of which Irenæus saith, [m] "it was written accurately, out of which such as will and mind their salvation may learn the character of his faith and the preaching of truth." And St. Jerome, speaking of Polycarp, saith, [n] "He wrote to the Philippians a very useful epistle, which to this day is read in the Asian assemblies." The last is Clemens's Epistle to the Corinthians, concerning which St. Jerome saith, [o] "Clemens wrote from the church of Rome to that at Corinth a very useful epistle, which also in some places is publicly read, which seems to me to agree with the character of that epistle which goes under the name of Paul to the Hebrews." And Eusebius saith of this epistle, [p] "It is a great and an admirable one, which he wrote from the church of the Romans to that of the Corinthians, there being a sedition then at Corinth. And this epistle we know to be read publicly both long ago and also in our time." And so we have three discourses besure, like so many homilies, read publicly in the primitive churches; and therefore we do not recede from them in decreeing some to be read in ours,

---

[l] Ejusdem ordinis est libellus Tobiæ et Judeth et Maccabæorum libri: in Novo vero Testamento libellus, qui dicitur Pastoris sive Hermatis, &c.; quæ omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad autoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Ruffin. in expos. symb. [p. 26.]

[m] *Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴ Πολυκάρπου πρὸς Φιλιππίους γεγραμμένη ἱκανωτάτη· ἐξ ἧς καὶ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα τῆς ἀληθείας, οἱ βουλόμενοι καὶ φροντίζοντες τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας δύνανται μαθεῖν.* Euseb. hist. l. 4. c. [14.] ex Iren. adv. hæres. l. 3. c. 3. [4.]

[n] Scripsit ad Philippenses valde utilem epistolam, quæ usque hodie in Asiæ conventu legitur. Hieron. in catal. scrip. eccles. [p. 843. vol. II.]

[o] Clemens scripsit ex persona Romanorum ad ecclesiam Corinthiorum valde utilem epistolam, quæ et in nonnullis locis publice legitur, quæ mihi videtur characteri epistolæ, quæ sub Pauli nomine ad Hebræos fertur, convenire. Ibid. [p. 839.]

[p] *Μεγάλη δὲ καὶ θαυμασία, ἣν ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τῇ Κορινθίων διετυπώσατο, στάσεως τηνικάδε κατὰ τὴν Κόρινθον γενομένης. Ταύτην δὲ καὶ ἐν πλείσταις ἐκκλησίαις ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ δεδημοσιευμένην πάλαι τε καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἔγνωμεν.* Euseb, hist. l. 3. c. [16.]

ARTICLE XXXVI.

OF CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS AND MINISTERS.

The book of consecration of archbishops and bishops, and ordering of priests and deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering: neither hath it any thing that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the second year of the aforenamed king Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

THOUGH this article when first composed had reference to one book, and by the late act for uniformity to another, yet in both it hath reference but to one and the same manner of consecration of archbishops and bishops, and ordering of priests and deacons; for though there be some expressions inserted into the latter, which were not in the former book, yet they both agree in that which is the form and substance of consecration and ordination; both of them appointing that in the consecration of a bishop, the archbishop and bishops present shall lay their hands upon his head; that in the ordering of priests, the bishop and priests present shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the order of priesthood; and that in the ordering of deacons, the bishop only shall lay his hands severally upon the head of every one of them: and so that the bishops shall be consecrated by the archbishop of the province or metropolitan, other bishops being present and laying on their hands with him; priests by the bishop of the diocese, or some other bishop appointed by him, other priests being present and laying on their hands too with him; deacons by the bishop only: in which consisteth the form and substance of all their ordinations. And therefore also in the speaking to them I need do no more than shew that the several orders of bishops, priests, and deacons are to be consecrated and ordered according to that form and manner; even that a bishop be consecrated by the archbishop of the province, (or some other bishop appointed by lawful authority,) the other bishops there present joining with him in laying on of hands; that a priest be ordered by a bishop, other priests there present and laying on their hands too; and that a deacon be ordered by the bishop only.

And for the proof of this I shall refer myself wholly to the judgment of the primitive church; who, having the happiness to live nearer the apostles' times than we do, were better acquainted with the apostles' practice in these things than we. And for my own part I dare not but look upon the practice of the primitive church in this case to be lawful in itself and binding unto others. For if we once suppose that the primitive church generally erred in their ordination of ministers, then we must grant also that there hath been never a lawful ministry since, the lawfulness of their ministry depending principally, yea only, upon the lawfulness of their ordination; and if there were no lawful ministers to ordain them, they who were ordained could not be lawful ministers; and if there be no lawful ministry, there cannot be any true church, because the word is not lawfully preached nor the sacraments lawfully administered in it. And therefore we must needs grant that in this besure, though in nothing else, the general practice of the primitive church must be allowed of.

Now to find out the general practice of the primitive church in this case we must not consult particular persons, but rather universal and provincial councils, wherein whole churches met together. The practice and judgment of particular persons cannot be said to be the practice and judgment of the whole church; but what whole councils decreed or did cannot be looked upon but as the practice and judgment, not of many particular persons only, but of the church itself.

First therefore for the consecration of bishops. The ancient council at Antioch put forth this decree, [a] "Let not a bishop be ordained without the assembly and presence of the metropolitan of the province. And he being present, it is very convenient that all his fellow bishops in the province be present with him, and it is fitting that the metropolitan should by his letter call them together. And if they can all meet, it is better. But if that be difficult, many of them should howsoever be present, or else give in their suffrages by their letters; and so the constitution be made with the presence and suffrage of many of them. But if it be done otherwise than is here decreed, let the ordination be invalid, or of no force." The first council at Nice: [b] "But this is altogether manifest, that if any one be made a bishop without the sentence of the metropolitan, this great council decrees that such a one ought not to be a bishop." And so the council at Laodicea determined, [c] "that bishops be consecrated by the judgment of the metropolitan and bishops there about, unto ecclesiastical government, being before long examined in the matter of their faith and polity, or dispensation of right reason;" [d] "which canon," as Balsamon saith, "forbids bishops to be chosen by the multitude, and decrees that they be consecrated by the metropolitans and other bishops." The second council at Arles : [e] "Let no bishop without the permission of the metropolitan, nor any metropolitan bishop without three bishops of the same province, presume to ordain a bishop." And again : [f] "But let this be clear above all things, that he that is made a bishop without the metropolitan, according to the great synod, (viz. the Nicene before cited,) ought not to be a bishop at all." To these we might add also the first of the apostolical canons, [g] "Let a bishop be ordained by two or three bishops." The council of Hippo, [h] "Let not a bishop be ordained by less than three bishops." The like was also decreed by the first council at [i] Arles, and another at [j] Rhegium. And what these bishops were to do at the consecration of a bishop, the fourth council at Carthage expressly tells us, decreeing thus : [k] "When a bishop is ordained, let two bishops hold the book of the gospels over his head, and one pouring forth the blessing upon him, let the other bishops that are present touch his head with their hands, or put their hands upon his head." So then in the primitive church both the metropolitan or archbishop, and other bishops, were to be present at the consecration of a bishop, and put their hands upon him, which exactly answers the manner of making and

---

[a] Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι δίχα συνόδου καὶ παρουσίας τοῦ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει τῆς ἐπαρχίας· τούτου δὲ παρόντος ἐξάπαντος βελτίον μὲν συνεῖναι αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ συλλειτουργοὺς, καὶ προσήκει δι' ἐπιστολῆς τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει συγκαλεῖν, καὶ εἰ μὲν ἀπαντοῖεν οἱ πάντες, βέλτιον· εἰ δὲ δυσχερὲς εἴη τοῦτο, τούς γε πλείους ἐξάπαντος παρεῖναι δεῖ, ἢ διὰ γραμμάτων ὁμοψήφους γενέσθαι· καὶ οὕτως μετὰ τῆς τῶν πλειόνων ἤτοι παρουσίας ἤτοι ψήφου γινέσθαι τὴν κατάστασιν. Εἰ δὲ ἄλλως παρὰ τὰ ὡρισμένα γένοιτο, μηδὲν ἰσχύειν τὴν χειροτονίαν. Concil. Antioch. can. 19. [p. 601. vol. I. Conc. Hard.]

[b] Καθόλου δὲ πρόδηλον ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι εἴ τις χωρὶς γνώμης μητροπολίτου γένοιτο ἐπίσκοπος, τὸν τοιοῦτον ἡ μεγάλη σύνοδος ὥρισε μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον. Concil. Nicen. can. 6. [p. 325. ibid.] v. et can. 4.

[c] Τοὺς ἐπισκόπους κρίσει τῶν μητροπολιτῶν καὶ τῶν πέριξ ἐπισκόπων καθίστασθαι εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἄρχην, ὄντας ἐκ πολλοῦ δεδοκιμασμένους, ἔν τε τῷ λόγῳ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ τῇ τοῦ εὐθέος λόγου πολιτείᾳ. Concil. Laodic. can. 12. [p. 783. ibid.]

[d] Καὶ ὁ παρὼν κανὼν κωλύει ὑπὸ τοῦ

ὄχλου τοὺς ἐπισκόπους ψηφίζεσθαι· καὶ διορίζεται παρὰ μητροπολιτῶν καὶ ἐπισκόπων τούτους καθίστασθαι. Balsam. in loc. [Bever. synod. vol. I. p. 458.]

[e] Nullus episcopus sine metropolitani permissu, nec episcopus metropolitanus sine tribus episcopis comprovincialibus, præsumat episcopum ordinare. Concil. Arelat. 2. can. 5. [Ivonis decret. v. 138.]

[f] Illud autem ante omnia clareat, eum, qui sine conscientia metropolitani constitutus fuerit episcopus, juxta magnam synodum esse episcopum non debere. Ibid. can. [6. p. 773. vol. II. Conc. Hard.]

[g] *Ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν.* Can. apost. 1. [vol. I. ibid.]

[h] Ut eipiscopus minus quam a tribus episcopis non ordinetur. Concil. Hippon. [39. p. 972. ibid.]

[i] De his qui usurpant sibi quod soli debeant episcopum ordinare; placuit ut nullus hoc sibi præsumat, nisi assumptis secum aliis septem episcopis. Si tamen non potuerint septem, sine tribus fratribus non audeant ordinare. Concil. Arelat. 1. can. 20. [p. 266. ibid.]

[j] Concil. Rhegiens. c. 1, 2. [p. 1748. ibid.]

[k] Episcopus cum ordinatur, duo episcopi ponant et teneant evangeliorum codicem super caput et verticem ejus, et uno super eum fundente benedictionem, reliqui omnes episcopi, qui adsunt, manibus suis caput ejus tangant. Concil. Carthag. 4. c. 2. [p. 979. ibid.]

consecrating bishops now in use amongst us, and decreed in this article.

And as for the second, viz. the ordering of priests, the practice of the primitive church may be seen also in these particulars: first, the apostolical canons (though perhaps not apostolical, yet besure very ancient) say, [l] "Let a priest be ordained by one bishop, and so a deacon and other clergymen." In the fourth [third] council at Carthage [m] Aurelius said, "There may be one bishop by whom, through the permission of God, many priests may be ordained," or, as the Greek translation hath it, [n] "By the permission of God one bishop may ordain many priests."

The council at Antioch: [o] "A bishop may also ordain priests and deacons, and handle all things with judgment, but undertake to do nothing further, without the bishop of the metropolis, nor he without the sentence of the others." Hence is that of the council at Chalcedon: [p] "If any bishop shall for money make ordination, or sell that grace which cannot be sold, or for money ordain any bishop, suffragan, priest, or deacon, he that is convinced of doing this, let him be in danger of losing his own degree;" plainly implying that it was he only that ordained him. The council of Nice: [q] "If any (of the Paulianists) was in ancient time in the clergy, if they appear unreprovable, being baptized again, let them be ordained by a bishop of the catholic church." It was by a bishop they were to be ordained; and therefore, saith the second council at Seville, [r] "A bishop can alone of himself give honour to priests and ministers, but he cannot take it away alone."

---

[l] *Πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ ἑνὸς ἐπισκόπου χειροτονείσθω, καὶ διάκονος, καὶ λοιποὶ κληρικοί.* Can. apost. 2. [ibid.]

[m] Aurelius episcopus dixit: Sed episcopus unus esse potest; per quem, dignatione divina, presbyteri multi constitui possunt. Concil. Carthag. 4. [3.] c. 45. [p. 967. ibid.]

[n] *Κατὰ συγχώρησιν Θεοῦ δύναται ὁ εἷς ἐπίσκοπος πολλοὺς χειροτονεῖν πρεσβυτέρους.* Balsam. in synod. Carthag. p. [588. vol. I. Bever. synod.]

[o] *Ὡς καὶ χειροτονεῖν πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, καὶ μετὰ κρίσεως ἕκαστα διαλαμβάνειν, περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δίχα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ αὐτὸν ἄνευ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης.* Concil. Antioch. can. 9. [p. 597. vol. I. Conc. Hard.]

[p] *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ χρήμασι χειροτονίαν ποιήσατο, καὶ εἰς πρᾶσιν καταγάγοι τὴν ἄπρατον χάριν, καὶ χειροτονήσοι ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ χωρεπίσκοπον, ἢ πρεσβύτερον, ἢ διάκονον,* &c. *ὁ τοῦτο ἐπιχειρήσας, ἐλεγχθεὶς κινδυνευέτω, περὶ τὸν οἰκεῖον βαθμόν.* Concil. Chalced. can. 2. [p. 601. vol. II. ibid.]

[q] *Εἰ δὲ τινὲς τῷ παρεληλυθότι χρόνῳ ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ἐξητάσθησαν, εἰ μὲν ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀνεπίληπτοι φανεῖεν, ἀναβαπτισθέντες χειροτονείθωσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου.* Concil. Nicen. can. 19. [p. 331. vol. I. ibid.]

Nay, so strict was the primitive church in having priests ordained by bishops only, that in the time of ordination, though the bishop was present and did some things, yet unless he did all he ought to do, the person was not looked upon as ordained, as we see in the aforesaid council at Seville: [s] "It is told us," say they, "concerning some of the clergy, whereof whilst one should be ordained to the priesthood, and two to the ministry of the Levites, the bishop, being troubled with sore eyes, is reported to have put his hand upon them only, and that a certain priest, contrary to the ecclesiastical order, gave the blessing to them, who, though if he was yet alive, might after accusation be condemned for so great boldness, yet seeing he being left to divine trial cannot be accused by human judgment, these that are alive, let them lose the degree of priesthood, or of the Levitical order, which they got perversely." And thus in the primitive church if any one was convinced not to have been ordained by a bishop, he was looked upon as a layman, be he ordained by whom he would else; and therefore the second general council held at Constantinople decreed, [t] "concerning Maximus the Cynic, and that disturbance that was made at Constantinople by him, that Maximus neither was nor is a bishop, neither are any of these that were ordained by him in any degree of the clergy, all things that were done for him or by him being disannulled." Having once pronounced Maximus no bishop, they presently declare all ordained by him to be laymen. And there was a remarkable passage to this purpose also in the council of Alexandria; for it being objected by the Arians against Athanasius, amongst other things, that one Macarius, a deacon of his, had broken a sacramental cup, the synod at Alexandria examined this amongst the other things that were laid to his charge, and find that at the time and place where his adversaries said the fact was done, [u] there was no ecclesiastical person or clergyman there, and by consequence no sacramental cup. But it was said that Ischyras was there. "But Ischyras," say they, [x] "how came Ischyras to be a priest? who ordained him? to wit Coluthus? For that is all they can say. But that Coluthus was but a priest himself when he died, and all his imposition of hands made void, and all that were ordained by him in the schism are no more than laymen, and are so admitted to the sacrament, is evident, so that no one doubts of it. And how then shall a private person, dwelling in a private house, be believed to have a mystical or sacramental cup?" So that Ischyras, though ordained, yet being ordained by one that was himself no more than a priest, no bishop, he is looked upon as no priest, but a layman, a private person, and that not only by the council at Alexandria, but by another at Sardice, "who," say [y] they, "gave the reward of calumny unto Ischyras, calling him bishop who was not so much as a priest." And thus we see how in the primitive church it was bishops only that ordained priests, and they were no priests who were not ordained by bishops, insomuch that [z] St. Chrysostome, yea, and [a] St. Jerome himself too, could not but say that ordination, though nothing else, was peculiar to bishops; so that though presbyters should be thought to be equal to bishops in other things, yet in this business of ordination bishops must needs be acknowledged to be above them.

---

[r] Episcopus enim sacerdotibus et ministris solus honorem dare potest, auferre solus non potest. Concil. Hispal. 2. c. 6. [p. 559. vol. III. ibid.]

[s] Relatum est nobis de quibusdam clericis quorumdam unus ad presbyterium, duo ad Levitarum ministerium sacrarentur, episcopus oculorum dolore detentus, fertur manus suas super eos tantum imposuisse, et presbyter quidam illis contra ecclesiasticum ordinem benedictionem dedisse, qui licet propter tantam audaciam poterat accusatus damnari si adhuc viveret, sed quia jam ille examini divino relictus, humano judicio accusari non potest, hi qui supersunt gradum sacerdotii, vel Levitici ordinis, quem perverse adepti sunt, amittant. Ibid. can. 5.

[t] Περὶ Μαξίμου τοῦ Κυνικοῦ καὶ τῆς κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ἀταξίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει γενομένης, ὥστε μήτε Μάξιμον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ εἶναι, μητὲ τοὺς παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ χειροτονηθέντας ἐν οἵῳ δήποτε βαθμῷ κλήρου, πάντων καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ γενομένων ἀκυρωθέντων. Concil. Constantinop. 1. can. 4. [p. 809. vol. I. ibid.]

---

[u] *Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὐχ ὅτι κἂν σχισματικῶν ποτήριον κέκλασται παρὰ Μακαρίου, ἀλλ' ὅτι μηδὲν ἦν ὅλως ἐκεῖ· πῶς γάρ; ὅπου μήτε τόπος κυριακῆς, μήτε τὶς ἐκεῖ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλὰ μήτε ὁ καιρὸς τῶν μυστηρίων ἦν.* Concil. Alexandr. apud Athanas. in apol. [p. 134. vol. I.]

[x] *Πόθεν οὖν πρεσβύτερος Ἰσχύρας; τίνος καταστήσαντος; ἆρα Κολούθου; τοῦτο γὰρ λοιπόν. Ἀλλ' ὅτι Κολοῦθος πρεσβύτερος ὢν ἐτελεύτησε, καὶ πᾶσα χεὶρ αὐτοῦ γέγονεν ἄκυρος, καὶ πάντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ κατασταθέντες ἐν τῷ σχίσματι λαϊκοὶ γεγόνασι, καὶ οὕτως συνάγονται, δῆλον, καὶ οὐδενὶ καθέστηκεν ἀμφίβαλλον· Πῶς οὖν ἰδιώτης ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οἰκίσκον οἰκῶν ἰδιωτικὸν, ποτήριον ἔχειν μυστικὸν πιστευθείη;* ibid.

[y] *Ἀμέλει τῆς συκοφαντίας αὐτῆς μισθὸν τῷ Ἰσχύρᾳ δεδώκασιν ἐπισκόπου ὄνομα, τῷ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρῳ τυγχάνοντι.* Concil. Sardic. apud Theodoret. hist. eccles. l. 2. c. [6. p. 592. vol. III.]

And if we search into the manner of this their episcopal ordination, Theophilus Alexandrinus saith, [b] "Concerning those that are to be ordained, this shall be the form or manner, that all the priesthood shall consent and choose, and then the bishop shall examine him, or the priesthood assenting to him, he shall ordain in the middle of the church, the people being present, and the bishop asking if the people also can witness for him; but let not ordination be done privately." And the fourth council of Carthage plainly, [c] "When a priest is ordained, the bishop blessing him, and holding his hand upon his head, let all the priests also which are present hold their hands by the hand of the bishop upon his head." So exactly doth our form and manner of ordering priests answer that of the primitive church.

And lastly, for the ordering of deacons, [d] which the [fourth] council at Arles saith should not be ordained before twenty-five years old, besides that of the apostolical canons before cited, "Let a priest be ordered by one bishop, and so a deacon, and others also of the clergy." And what else makes to this purpose in the foregoing discourse, I shall only add that of the fourth council at Carthage, [e] "When a deacon is ordained, let the bishop only that blesseth him put his hand upon his head, because he is not ordained to the priesthood, but only to the ministry;" which is the very thing which the book this article hath reference unto prescribes. All which things being put together, unless we will say there was no lawful ministry in the primitive church, and by consequence none now, (for there is no lawful ministry but what is lawfully ordained, and the ministry of the primitive church, if it was not lawfully ordained, neither could it lawfully ordain others, and so all the ministry ever since, being unlawfully ordained, was no lawful ministry,) I say, unless we grant so grand an absurdity, we must needs subscribe to this article.

---

[z] Τί δήποτε; ὅτι οὐ πολὺ τὸ μέσον αὐτῶν (πρεσβυτέρων) καὶ ἐπισκόπων. Καὶ γὰρ τὶ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν εἰσὶν ἀναδεδεγμένοι, καὶ προστασίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Καὶ ἃ περὶ ἐπισκόπων εἶπε, ταῦτα καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἁρμόττει· τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ ὑπερβεβήκασι, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον δοκοῦσι πλεονεκτεῖν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους. Chrysost. in 1 Tim. hom. 11. init. [p. 289. vol. IV.]

[a] Quid facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus quod presbyter non faciat? Hieron. ad Evagrium, [ep. 146. p. 1076. vol. I.]

[b] Περὶ τῶν μελλόντων χειροτονεῖσθαι οὗτος ἔσται τύπος· ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἱερατεῖον συμφωνεῖν καὶ αἱρεῖσθαι, καὶ τότε τὸν ἐπίσκοπον δοκιμάζειν ἢ καὶ συναινοῦντος αὐτῷ τοῦ ἱερατείου χειροτονεῖν ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρόντος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ προσφωνοῦντος τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰ καὶ ὁ λαὸς δύναται αὐτῷ μαρτυρεῖν· χειροτονία δὲ λαθραίως μὴ γινέσθω. Theoph. Alexandr. can. 6. [p. 172. vol. II. Bever. synod.]

[c] Presbyter cum ordinatur episcopo eum benedicente et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri qui præsentes sunt manus suas juxta manus episcopi super caput illius teneant. Concil. Carthag. 4. can. 3. [p. 979. vol. I. Conc. Hard.]

[d] Ut diaconus ante 25 annos, et sacerdos ante 30 non ordinetur. Concil. Arel. [4.] c. 1. [tit. p. 1069. vol. II. ibid.]

---

[e] Diaconus cum ordinatur, solus episcopus qui eum benedicit manum super caput illius ponat, quia non ad sacerdotium sed ad ministerium consecratur. Concil. Carthag. 4. c. 4. [p. 979. ibid.]

ARTICLE XXXVII.

OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.

The king's majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England and other his dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction. Where we attribute to the king's majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's word or of the sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our queen do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

IN these words we have the power of the civil magistrate asserted, and the assertion of that power explained. For here it is first asserted that the king's majesty hath the chief government of all estates in this and the other of his dominions, both ecclesiastical and civil. And then it is added, that the power of the administering of God's word or sacraments is not by this assertion granted to the king, but that his power is still to keep itself within the limits of a civil power, though it may extend itself to ecclesiastical persons or causes.

But for the better opening and confirming of this we must call to mind how the most high God, the supreme Governor of all churches and states in the world, hath been pleased, for the more orderly government of both, to settle a distinct power in each, the power of the keys in the church, and the power of the sword in the state, answerable to the two essential parts of man, his soul and his body; for the power of the keys committed to the church, that reacheth to the soul only, not to the body; and the power of the sword committed to the civil magistrate, that reacheth to the body only, not to the soul; but both together they have influence both upon the soul and body, or outward man. And though both these powers be united in God, the fountain of all power, yet when derived from Him they are still separated from one another, so that they are not seated together in one and the same person; but the civil magistrate, to whom the power of the sword is granted, to him is the power of the keys denied; and the church, to which the power of the keys is granted, to it is the power of the sword denied. And therefore was Peter, who had the power of keys, commanded to put up his sword, Matt. xxvi. 52, and Uzziah, who had the power of the sword, punished for using the keys, 2 Chron. xxvi.; so that the priest hath no power to execute any part of the king's office, neither hath the king any power to execute any part of the priest's office; but these being two distinct offices and ordinances appointed by God, he that hath the keys must use them, not the sword, and he that hath the sword must use it, and not the keys.

And hence it is that when the power of the civil magistrate was asserted to extend itself to ecclesiastical persons and causes, as well as civil, it is forthwith added, *Where we attribute to the king's majesty the chief government, (by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended,) we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's word or of the sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our queen do most plainly testify.* In which words we being referred to the queen's Injunctions for the further explication of this particular, we must consider what is there written to this purpose; and amongst other things we find it there said, [a] "And further, her majesty forbiddeth all manner of her subjects to give ear or credit to such perverse and malicious persons, which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to notify to her loving subjects, how, by the words of the same oath, (viz. of supremacy,) it may be collected, the kings or queens of this realm, possessors of the crown, may challenge authority and power of ministry of divine offices in the church, wherein her said subjects are much abused by such evil disposed persons. For certainly her majesty neither doth nor ever will challenge any other authority than that was challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of famous memory, king Henry the Eighth and king Edward the Sixth, which is and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm, that is, under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them." And for the confirmation of this sense put upon the oath of supremacy, and so the king's sovereignty, there was a proviso also established by act of parliament to this purpose: [b] "Provided also that the oath expressed in the same act made in the first year shall be taken and expounded in such form as is set forth in an admonition annexed to the queen's majesty's Injunctions, published in the first year of her majesty's reign; that is to say, to confess and acknowledge in her majesty, her heirs and successors, none other authority than that was challenged and lately used by the noble king Henry the Eighth and king Edward the Sixth, as in the said admonition may more plainly appear." By which we may see how vain and groundless the scandal is which is usually cast upon the oath of supremacy, as if we there acknowledged the king to have the keys as well as the sword committed to him, and that he might administer the word and sacraments in spiritual, as well as justice and judgment in secular affairs;

---

[a] In the admonition annexed to queen Elizabeth's Injunctions. [p. 83. Sparrow's coll.]

[b] Stat. of 5 Elizab. cap. 1.

whereas the same power that asserted the king's supremacy hath still denied it to extend to the exercise of any spiritual function.

But though the power of the sword and that of the keys be not seated in one and the same subject, yet it doth not follow but they may be exercised upon one and the same object, so that the selfsame person, yea, for one and the same crime, may be punished by both powers; for though they be two distinct powers, yet each of them is to be *custos utriusque tabulæ*, to look to the observance and punish the breach of both tables, but still keeping themselves within their own limits: as for example, theft, treason, murder, are breaches of the second table, and therefore to be punished by the civil magistrate; yet the persons guilty of such crimes may be punished by the church also, even excommunicated for them. So, on the other side, blasphemy, heresy, and idolatry, are breaches of the first table, and so to be punished immediately by the church; yet they may, yea, and ought to be punished by the civil magistrate too; neither is there any other power whereby a heretic or blasphemer can be put to death, but only by the power of the sword: and therefore it must needs be granted, that as the breaches of the second table may be punished by the power of the keys as well as by the power of the sword, [c] so may the breaches of the first table be punished by the power of the sword as well as by the power of the keys; and if so, the power of the civil magistrate must needs reach to spiritual or ecclesiastical, as well as secular or temporal causes; for all the first table consists of nothing else. And this, the punishing with the civil sword all manner of persons guilty of ecclesiastical as well as secular crimes, seems to be the prerogative here principally given to the king's majesty in this article, as appears in these words: *But we give to our princes only that prerogative, &c. that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers:* so that the supremacy that is here given him is, that he may punish all manner of persons for all manner of crimes, whether ecclesiastical or temporal, with the civil sword.

---

[c] Quomodo ergo reges Domino serviunt in timore nisi ea quæ contra jussa Domini fiunt religiosa severitate prohibendo, atque plectendo? Aliter enim servit quia homo est, aliter quia etiam rex est: quia homo est, ei servit vivendo fideliter, quia vero etiam rex est, servit leges justa præcipientes et contraria prohibentes convenienti vigore sanciendo. Sicut servivit Hezechias lucos et templa idolorum et illa excelsa quæ contra præcepta Dei fuerant extructa destruendo, sicut servivit Jozias talia et ipse faciendo, sicut servivit rex Ninivitarum universam civitatem ad placandum Dominum compellendo. Aug. epist. ad Bonifac. [185. 19. vol. I.]

And seeing all manner of persons and causes are thus to be subject to him and punishable by him, it necessarily follows that he hath power and authority over them, whether ecclesiastical or civil. So that he may command ecclesiastical as well as civil persons to give obedience to ecclesiastical as well as civil laws, yea, and punish them for their disobedience. What disorders are brought into the church, he may and ought to reform them; what needless or dangerous controversies arise in the church, he may and ought to still them; as also he may and ought to see *that all things be done decently and in order;* and to that end may, either of himself or by the advice of a council, prescribe rules and canons to be observed in the external order of divine worship; so that he may call a council when he pleaseth, dismiss it when he pleaseth, and confirm their decrees and constitutions so far as himself pleaseth; so that nothing they prescribe is obligatory under any temporal penalty without his consent, though what he prescribes is obligatory without their consent. And thus king James, who was a person well acquainted with the extent of his own power: [d] The king's supremacy, saith he, implies a power to command "obedience to be given to the word of God, by reforming religion according to his prescribed will, by assisting the spiritual power with his temporal sword, by reformation of corruption, by procuring due obedience to the church, by judging and cutting off all frivolous questions and schisms, as Constantine did, and finally, by making decorum to be observed in all indifferent things for that purpose, which is the only intent of the oath of supremacy." To which we may also add, that appeals ought to be made in all causes, ecclesiastical and civil, from all other persons unto him, and to him only. So that it is lawful to appeal from any other unto him, but not from him to any other. And in the exercise of this his power he is to make the testimonies of God the men of his counsel, as king David did, Psalm cxix. 24, but is not bound to give account of his actions and exercise of his power to any person upon earth, but only to the God of heaven; and therefore may well be styled supreme governor (under God) over all persons, and in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, within his majesty's realms and dominions.

---

[d] King James's apolog. p. [284. of his Works.]

Neither is this any other prerogative than what hath been still given to godly princes in the holy scriptures by God himself; for thus we find king David, *a man after God's own heart, gathered together all the princes of Israel, with the priests and Levites*, prescribing them rules to be observed in the worship of God, 1 Chron. xxiii. 2, &c. xxv. and xxvi; and therefore it is said, *All these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of the Lord, with symbols, psalteries, and harps, for the service of the house of God, according to the king's order to Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman*, c. xxv. 6; so that it seems the king had given them order about the service of God. Thus good king Josiah *commanded Hilkiah the high priest, and the priests of the second order, and the keepers of the door, to bring forth out of the temple of the Lord all the vessels that were made for Baal*, &c. 2 Kings xxiii. 4. And certainly he would not have commanded such ecclesiastical persons unless he had had the command over them. Neither had he power over ecclesiastical persons only, but in ecclesiastical causes too, otherwise he could never have made such a reformation in the church as he then did, ibid. c. xxii. and c. xxiii. And thus did prince Moses *burn the golden calf*, Exod. xxxii. 20. *And king Hezekiah removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brasen serpent that Moses had made*, 2 Kings xviii. 4. *And king Jehoshaphat charged the priests and Levites, saying, Thus shall ye do in the fear of the Lord faithfully and with a perfect heart*, 2 Chron. xix. 9. Nay, so great was the power of the princes then over ecclesiastical persons, that the high priests themselves were reproved or deposed at the princes' pleasure: for thus we find Aaron the high priest reproved by Moses, Exod. xxxii. 21, and Abiathar the high priest deposed by Solomon, 1 Kings ii. 26, 27. And to manifest the prince's power in ecclesiastical causes too, Mordecai, who then was the only prince amongst the Jews, ordained the feast of Purim, Esth. ix. 20, 21, 26; even as our king, now upon occasion, appoints fasting or thanksgiving days to be observed by all his people.

And if we pass from the Old to the New Testament, there we have a strict command from the great God by St. Paul, saying, *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers*, Rom. xiii. 1; where, as St. Chrysostom observes, "the apostle [e] shewing how he commands this to all, both priests and monks, and not only to secular persons, he makes it clear from the first words, saying, *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers*, though he be an apostle, though he be an evangelist, though he be a prophet, or whosoever he be;" so that ecclesiastical as well as lay persons are to *be subject to the higher powers.* But what higher powers? Why St. Basil tells us: [f] "Paul the apostle, writing to the Romans, commands that they be subject to all powers that have the preeminence, to secular not spiritual powers; and this he manifests by what he adds, speaking of tribute and custom." So that ecclesiastical persons also are here commanded to be subject to the civil magistrate, and then the civil magistrate must needs have power over ecclesiastical persons. And therefore doth St. Peter write to all persons, of what quality or degree soever, saying, *Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake*, 1 Pet. ii. 13; where by *every ordinance of man* he meaneth [g] kings and governors, as himself in the words immediately following explaineth himself, saying, *whether it be to the king*,

---

[e] Καὶ δεικνὺς ὅτι πᾶσι ταῦτα διατάττεται, καὶ ἱερεῦσι καὶ μοναχοῖς, οὐχὶ τοῖς βιωτικοῖς μόνον, ἐκ προοιμίων αὐτὸ δῆλον ἐποίησεν, οὕτω λέγων, πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω, κᾂν ἀπόστολος, κᾂν εὐαγγελιστὴς, κᾂν προφήτης, κᾂν ὁστισοῦν. Chrysost. in Rom. hom. 23. [p. 189. 17. vol. III.]

[f] Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Ῥωμαίοις ἐπιστέλλων προστάσσει πάσαις ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι, ἐξουσίαις ταῖς τοῦ κόσμου, οὐ ταῖς πνευματικαῖς, καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν ἐπαγομένων ἐδήλωσεν, εἰπὼν περὶ φέρων καὶ τέλους. Basil. Constit. monast. c. 22. init. [p. 789. vol. II.]

[g] Κτίσιν ἀνθρωπίνην τὰς ἀρχὰς λέγει τὰς χειροτονητὰς ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων, ἢ καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς βασιλεῖς, καθότι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐτάχθησαν ἤτοι ἐτέθησαν. Œcum. in loc. [p. 499. vol. II.]

as supreme; or unto governors, as [*unto*] *them that are sent by him:* where we may also observe how the apostle supposeth the king to be supreme. So that to deny him to be supreme would be as much as to deny him to be king; I say supreme, and that not only in civil but in ecclesiastical causes; and therefore it was that St. Paul in an ecclesiastical cause (to wit, whether he was a seducer, or whether his doctrine was to be allowed of, or he to be condemned for it or no) appeals to Cæsar, Acts xxv. 11; yea, and in the verse immediately foregoing he saith, *I stand at Cæsar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged,* v. 10. So that it was Cæsar that ought to determine the controversy; and if heathen princes were, it cannot be denied but that Christian kings must needs be the supreme governors in all causes, and over all persons, ecclesiastical as well as civil, within their realms and dominions.

And if we consult the practice of the primitive church in this particular, Socrates tells us expressly, [h] "We often comprehend kings in our history, because that from the time they began to be Christians, the business of the church, or ecclesiastical causes, depended upon them." And certainly Constantine the Great looked upon himself as much concerned in ecclesiastical affairs, when in his letters to the churches he saith expressly, [i] "Having had experience from the prosperity of our common or secular affairs, how great the grace of God hath been towards us, I judged it my duty, before all other things, to consider how, in the blessed multitude of the catholic church, one faith, and sincere love, and unanimous piety towards Almighty God might be preserved;" which certainly, if there be any, were truly ecclesiastical causes; yet he, though a secular prince, esteemed it his duty to look after them in the first place. And therefore, [k] "mustering as it were the army of God, he gathered together an œcumenical synod, calling by his honourable letters the bishops from all places to make haste thither. Neither was the command all, but the authority of the king helped much." By which it appears, that he looked upon himself as the chief governor over ecclesiastical persons as well as in ecclesiastical causes, otherwise he could not have laid such commands upon them to take such journeys as many of them did at his will and pleasure. Neither did the emperor only call that famous council, but it was he that confirmed their decrees too. For [l] "Athanasius," saith Theodoret, "going to Constans the emperor, minded him of his father and of the great synod which he gathered together, and how he, being present at the assembly, confirmed by a law what was written by them." From whence it appears, that then the civil magistrate had power not only over persons but in causes ecclesiastical, seeing the convocation and confirmation of councils depended upon them. But we need not insist any longer upon œcumenical councils, for we have shewed before, art. XXI., how none of them were gathered together but by the commandment and will of princes.

---

[h] Συνεχῶς καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῇ ἱστορίᾳ περιλαμβάνομεν, διότι ἀφ' οὗ χριστιανίζειν ἤρξαντο, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πράγματα ἤρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν. Socrat. proœm. ad l. 5. hist. eccles. [p. 263.] v. Allat. de cons. pp. 219. 343.

[i] Πεῖραν λαβὼν ἐκ τῆς κοινῶν εὐπραξίας, ὅση τῆς θείας δυνάμεως πέφυκε χάρις, τοῦτο πρό γε πάντων ἔκρινά μοι προσήκειν σκοπεῖν, ὅπως παρὰ τοῖς μακαριωτάτοις τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας πλήθεσι, πίστις μία, καὶ εἰλικρινὴς ἀγάπη, ὁμογνώμων τε περὶ τὸν παγκρατῆ Θεὸν εὐσέβεια τηρῆται. Euseb. de vit. Constant. l. 3. c. [17. p. 586.]

But the principal question is concerning national or provincial councils, whether every particular prince (and so ours) hath power to gather them together and confirm their decrees or no. For certainly, if the convocation and confirmation of all ecclesiastical councils within his realm depends solely and principally upon him, it must needs follow, that he is supreme both over persons and in causes ecclesiastical as well as civil, it being in such councils that all ecclesiastical causes are determined.

And for the resolving of this question, though we cannot deny that the primate and metropolitan of the province hath sometime used to gather the bishops of his province together into a council where himself pleased, yet we cannot but also aver, that they could not do it without the commandment and will of princes; yea, and that the kings themselves have still had power to gather them together at his pleasure and command, otherwise, certainly Gregory the Great would never have written to king [m] Theodoricus and [n] Theodobertus, that they would gather synods together in their own kingdoms. And if we search into the primitive church, we shall still find kings and princes still calling the ecclesiastical councils together. The first council at Orleans, in a letter to king Clodoveus, begins thus: [o] "To their lord, the most glorious king Clodoveus, the son of the catholic church, All the priests which you commanded to come to the council. Because your so great care of the glorious faith to the worship of the catholic religion hath stirred you up, that, with the affection of a priestly mind, you have commanded all priests to be gathered together, to treat about necessary things," &c. And the second council at Orleans begins, [p] "When by the command of our most glorious kings we were met together in the city of Orleans, to treat, by the help of God, concerning the observation of the catholic law." And so the fifth council at Orleans, [q] "Our most gracious prince therefore, famous with triumphant titles, our lord Childeberte, when for his love of the faith and care of religion he had gathered together the priests in the city of Orleans." The second council at Paris,

---

[k] Εἶθ' ὥσπερ ἐπιστρατεύων αὐτῷ Θεοῦ φάλαγγα, σύνοδον οἰκουμενκὴν συνεκρότει, σπεύδειν ἁπανταχόθεν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους γράμμασι τιμητικοῖς προκαλούμενος· οὐκ ἦν θ' ἁπλοῦν τὸ ἐπίταγμα· συνήργει δὲ καὶ αὐτῇ πράξει τὸ βασιλέως νεῦμα. Ibid. c. 6. [p. 579.]

[l] Ἀθανάσιος δὲ πρὸς Κώνσταντα ἀφικόμενος, &c. τοῦτε πατρὸς ἀπέμνησε, καὶ τῆς συνόδου τῆς μεγίστης, ἣν ἐκεῖνος συνελεξε, καὶ ὡς τὰ παρ' ἐκείνων γραφέντα, τοῦ συνεδρίου κοινωνῶν, ἐκράτυνε νόμῳ. Theodoret. hist. eccles. l. 2. κεφ. [γ. p. 586. vol. III.]

---

[m] Iterata vos pro vestra magna mercede adhortatione pulsamus, ut congregari synodum jubeatis. Greg. regist. l. [11. ep. 59. vol. II.] ad Theodoricum regem Franc.

[n] Itaque excellentia vestra Dei nostri mandatis inhærens, studium ad congregandam synodum pro sua mercede adhibere dignetur. Ibid. epist. [60.] ad Theodobertum reg. Franc.

[o] Domino suo catholicæ ecclesiæ filio Clodovæo gloriosissimo regi, omnes sacerdotes, quos ad concilium venire jussistis. Quia tanta ad religionis catholicæ cultum gloriosæ fidei cura vos excitat, ut sacerdotalis mentis affectu sacerdotes de rebus necessariis tractaturos in unum colligi jusseritis. Concil. Aurel. 1. [p. 1008. vol. II.]

[p] Cum ex præceptione gloriosissimorum regum in Aurelianensem urbem, de observatione legis catholicæ tractaturi, (Deo auxiliante) convenissemus. Concil. Aurel. 2. init. [p. 1174. ibid.]

[q] Itaque clementissimus princeps, triumphorum titulis invictissimus, dominus Childebertus, cum pro amore sacræ fidei, studio religionis, in Aurelianensium urbem congregasset in unum dominos sacerdotes. Concil. Aurel. 5. init. [p. 1443. ibid.]

[r] "When we were come to the city Paris, at the invitation of our most glorious lord and king Childeberte." And concerning the first council at Cabilone, Gregorius Turonensis saith, [s] "In the fourth year also of king Childeberte, which was the eighteenth year of the king Guntheramnus and Childericus, there was a synod gathered together at the city Cabilone, by the command of prince Guntheramnus." The first council at Matiscum, [t] "When being called out by our glorious lord king Guntheramnus, both for public causes and for the necessities of the poor, our meanness was met together in the city Matiscum," &c. And concerning the second council at the same place, Gregorius Turonensis saith, [u] "In the meanwhile the day comes, and the bishops, by the command of king Guntheramnus, were gathered together at the city Matiscum." The third council at Toledo, [w] "When, for the sincerity of his faith, the same glorious prince Richard had commanded all the priests within his dominion to come together." And presently, the king saith to the council, [x] "I suppose it is not unknown unto you, that for the restoring the form of ecclesiastical discipline I called you out to the presence of our serenity." Thus was the fourth council at Toledo gathered together by [y] king Sisenand, the [z] fifth and [a] sixth by Chintillan, the [b] seventh by Chindasiund, the [c] eighth,

---

[r] Cum in urbem Parisiensium ad invitationem domini regis gloriosissimi Childeberti venissemus. Concil. Paris. 2. init. [p. 335. vol. III.]

[s] Anno quoque quarto Childeberti regis, qui fuit decimus octavus Guntheramni et Childerici regum, apud Cabilonum civitatem synodus facta est ex jussu principis Guntheramni. Greg. Turon. hist. Franc. l. 5. c. 27.

[t] Cum ex evocatione gloriosissimi domini Guntheramni regis, tam pro causis publicis quam pro necessitatibus pauperum, in urbe Matiscensi mediocritas nostra convenisset. Concil. Matisc. 1. [præf. p. 451. vol. III.]

[u] Interim dies advenit et episcopi, ex jussu regis Guntheramni, apud Matisconensem urbem collecti sunt. Greg. Turon. hist. Franc. l. 8. c. 20.

[w] Cum pro fidei suæ sinceritate idem gloriosissimus princeps (Reccaredus) omnes regiminis sui pontifices in unum convenire mandasset. Concil. Tolet. 3. init. [p. 467. vol. III.]

[x] Non incognitum reor esse vobis, reverendissimi sacerdotes, quod propter instaurandam disciplinæ ecclesiasticæ formam ad nostræ vos serenitatis præsentiam evocaverim. Ibid.

[y] Anno tertio regnante domino nostro religiosissimo principe Sisenando, die nonarum Decembris, dum studio amoris Christi ac diligentia Sisenandi regis, Hispaniæ atque Gallitiæ sacerdotes apud Toletanam urbem in nomine Domini convenissemus. Concil. Tolet. 4. init. [p. 578. ibid.]

[z] Atque (Chintillanus rex noster) hanc institutionem, quam ex præcepto ejus et decreto nostro sancimus, divina inspiratione permisit. Concil. Tolet. 5. init. [p. 597. ibid.]

[a] Et gratias agimus Christianissimo et gloriosissimo Chintillano principi nostro, cujus studio advo-

ninth, and tenth by Reccesiunth, the [d] eleventh by king Wamban, the [e] twelfth by Eryingius. [f] The council at Clypiacum was gathered together by Clodoveus, the second king of France. And Sigebertus, in his chronicles, reports how [g] Theodoricus, king of France, gathered together a council too. [h] And the famous council at Constantinople, that condemned the worshipping of images, Theophanes tells us, was gathered together by the emperor Constantine. [i] Charles the Great gathered one council together at Duria, and several other in other places, as we shall see presently.

And to pass by many others which might be produced to the same purpose, if we should call to mind the ancient synods gathered together here in England, we shall find, that though the primate did sometimes with the consent of the king call them, yet at other times the king himself is expressly recorded to have gathered them together. As in particular, the council at Northampton, in the year 1138, [k] was gathered together

---

cati et instantia collecti sumus. Concil. Tolet. 6. fin. [p. 608. ibid.]

[b] Cum in nomine S. Trinitatis, pro quibusdam disciplinis ecclesiasticis, tam nostra devotione, quam studio serenissimi et amatoris Christi Chindasundi regis nostri apud Toletanam urbem conventus adesset. Concil. Tolet. 7. init. [p. 619. ibid.]

[c] Anno quinto orthodoxi atque gloriosi et veræ clementiæ dignitate præcipui Reccesiunthi regis, cum omnes divinæ ordinatio voluntatis, ejusdem principis serenissimo jussu, in basilica sanctorum apostolorum ad sacrum synodi coegisset congregari conventum. Concil. Tolet. 8. init. [p. 953. ibid.] v. et concil. Tolet. 9 et 10. init.

[d] Dum et aggregandi nobis, hortatu principis gloriosi (Wambani), facultas data est. Concil. Tolet. 11. init. [p. 1019. ibid.] cujus Wambani ordinatione collecti, cujus et studio aggregati sumus. Ibid. fin. [p. 1030.]

[e] Cum ex gloriosissimi prædicti principis Eryngii jussu in unum fuissemus aggregati conventum. Concil. Tolet. 12. init. [p. 1715. ibid.]

[f] Anno 16. ex quo sceptra susceperat regalia Clodoveus, pontifices et totius gentis principes Clypiacum convenire jubens. Aimon. l. 4. c. 41.

[g] Theodoricus rex Ebroninum in gratiam recipit, ejus consilio synodum episcoporum cogit. Sigebert. ad an. 685.

[h] Eodem quoque anno Constantinus impius contra sancta et venerabiles imagines concilium iniquum 338 episcoporum congregavit in palatio Hieriæ. Act. concil. Constantinop. apud Theophan. [p. 359.]

[i] Carolus contra Saxones hoc anno pugnaturus ad componendum prius statum ecclesiæ et reipublicæ Christianæ pro more suo piissimo episcopos et abbates convocavit in Duria. Annal. Franc. in vita Caroli magni.

[k] Rex Anglorum Stephanus in octavis paschæ, quod erat 4 idus Aprilis, tenuit concilium Northamptoniæ, cui præsidebat Eboracensis archiepiscopus, Turstanus. Continuat. Florent. [p. 1199. vol. VI. par. ii. concil. Hard.]

by king Stephen, in which Turstan, archbishop of York, was president; and not long after, there was another council held at the same place, wherein Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, was accused by the king of perjury, and commanded to give up his accounts for the many sums he had received when chancellor, in which office it seems he had been for many years; which he refusing to do, Gilbert, then lord bishop of London, (as it is related in the life of the said archbishop of Canterbury,) said, "that [l] considering the malice of the times, and what ruin might hang over the catholic church if the king should be resisted in these things, the archbishop ought to obey him and give place unto him;" and to this agreed the whole council, except Henry, bishop of Winchester. And Robertus de Monte relates, how [m] "Henry, king of England, gathered together all the bishops of Normandy, and abbots, and barons at New Market." From whence it appears, that both in this and other kingdoms kings have had the supreme power of the convocation of synods.

And as the civil magistrate hath still gathered synods together, so hath he confirmed them too. And therefore the first general council at Constantinople, in their synodical letter to Theodosius the emperor, say, [n] "We desire now your humanity, that the sentence of the synod might be confirmed by your religious writing or letters patent, that as you honoured the church by the letters whereby you called us, so you would strengthen with your seal the end of the decrees." And Flavius Constantinus, in his letter to the western people concerning the sixth general council, or the third at Constantinople, saith, [o] "And we therefore, desiring also to strengthen and confirm what was decreed by them, have put forth this present pious edict, holding out the confession of the true faith in divinity, according to the ecclesiastical statutes." So that the sixth general council was confirmed by Flavius Constantinus, as the first was by Constantinus Magnus; of which before. And for particular councils Regino tells us, [p] "that, by the command of Charles the Great, councils were celebrated by bishops all over France, concerning the state of the churches; whereof one was gathered together at Mentz, another at Rhemes, the third at Tours, a fourth at Caballon, a fifth at Arles; and the constitutions which were made by every one of them were confirmed by the emperor." And to name no more, at the end of the third council at Toledo it is expressly said, [q] "The council was confirmed by the public edict of the king, and every particular chapter being reduced to one head, he confirmed them, saying, 'I, Flavius Reccaredus, king, confirming what is here delivered, which we with the holy synod have defined, have subscribed or set my hand to it.'" By which it plainly appears, that in the primitive church ecclesiastical councils, wherein all ecclesiastical causes were concluded upon, were not only called but confirmed by the civil magistrate, who cannot therefore but be acknowledged to have had the supremacy in ecclesiastical as well as civil causes.

---

[l] Gilbertus Londoniensis episcopus (dixit) quod considerata temporum malitia et quanta ruina ecclesiæ catholicæ immineat si in his regi fiat resistentia deberet Cantuariensis ipsi obtemperare et cedere. Act. vit. Thomæ, apud Baron. ad an. 1164. [vid. p. 512. vol. XII. Baron. ann.]

[m] Henricus rex Anglorum congregavit omnes episcopos Normanniæ et abbates et barones apud Novum mercatum. Rob. de monte, in appendic. ad Sigebert. [p. 641. vol. I.] v. Nicet. 239. Jus. G[ræco] R[om.] 317.

[n] Δεόμεθα τοίνυν τῆς σῆς ἡμερότητος, γράμματι τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας ἐπικυρωθῆναι συνόδου τὴν ψῆφον· ἵν᾽ ὥσπερ τοῖς τῆς κλήσεως γράμμασι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τετίμηκας, οὕτω καὶ τῶν δοξάντων ἐπισφραγίσῃς τὸ τέλος. Concil. Constantinop. 1. ad Theodos. [p. 808. vol. I. concil. Hard.]

[o] Idcirco et nos, quæ ab iis definita sunt, corroborare atque firmare

And hence it is, that in the primitive church appeals were made also ultimately to the civil magistrate from all other persons whatsoever, as evidently appears in the case of Donatus, who, having accused Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, of

---

cupientes, præsens pium edictum edidimus, veræ circa divinitatem fidei secundum ecclesiastica statuta adnuncians confessionem. Flav. Constantinus populo habitanti in occiduis partibus, inter acta concil. Constantinop. 3. [p. 1447. vol. III. ibid.]

[p] Concilia jussu ejus super statum ecclesiarum per totam Galliam ab episcopis celebrata sunt; quorum unum Moguntiæ, alterum Rhemis, tertium Turonis, quartum Caballonis, quintum Arelatæ congregatum est; et constitutiones, quæ in singulis factæ sunt, ab imperatore confirmatæ sunt. Regino ad an. [813. p. 40. vol. I. Pistorii scriptt.]

[q] Publico edicto regis confirmatum est concilium et singula ejus capitula in unam summam redacta confirmavit dicens, Flavius Reccaredus rex hanc deliberationem, quam cum sancta definivimus synodo, confirmans subscripsi. Concil. Tolet. 3. fin. [vid. p. 484. vol. III. concil. Hard.]

several crimes, referreth the cause to the emperor Constantine, who, not willing to pass a final sentence upon a bishop himself, appoints other bishops to decide it, whereof the bishop of Rome, Melchiades, was one, who, searching into the case, found Cæcilian innocent; but Donatus appeals from them again to the emperor; the emperor, willing to have it ended, refers it to a council at Arles, who determining it against Donatus, he appeals from them too to the emperor, until he at length put a period to it. This is that which St. Augustine relates in his 166th [105th] epistle, where, writing to the Donatists, he saith, [r] "Know ye that your ancestors referred the cause of Cæcilian to the emperor Constantine. Exact this of us, we can prove it to you, and if we shall not prove it, do with us what ye can. But because Constantine durst not judge himself in the case of a bishop, he referred it to bishops to be discussed and ended: which also was done in Rome, Melchiades the bishop of that city being president, with many of his colleagues: who when they had pronounced Cæcilian innocent, and had condemned Donatus, which had caused a schism at Carthage, your ancestors came again to the emperor, complaining of the judgment of the bishops, in which they were conquered; for how can a wicked striver pray to those judges by whose judgment he is conquered? But yet the most gracious emperor made other bishops again judges at Arles, a city of France; and from them also did your ancestors appeal to the emperor himself; until he also had taken cognizance of the cause, and had pronounced Cæcilian innocent, and them reproachers." By which we may see, that appeals were then made from several bishops, (whereof he of Rome was one,) yea, and from a whole council too, to the civil magistrate; but when he had once decided the controversy, though they were not yet satisfied, yet they had no further to appeal, even in that ecclesiastical cause. So that the civil magistrate only having the supreme power in calling and confirming ecclesiastical synods, and unto whom appeals in ecclesiastical causes are ultimately to be made, we must needs grant that he is supreme in causes and over persons ecclesiastical as well as civil; and by consequence, that if our king be the supreme civil magistrate of this nation, (which to deny is downright treason,) he cannot but be acknowledged to be the person unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain.

---

[r] Scitote quod primi majores vestri causam Cæciliani ad imperatorem Constantinum detulerunt. Exigite hoc a nobis, probemus vobis, et si non probaverimus, facite de nobis quicquid potueritis. Sed quia Constantinus non est ausus de causa episcopi judicare, eam discutiendam atque finiendam episcopis delegavit. Quod et factum est in urbe Roma præsidente Melchiade episcopo illius ecclesiæ cum multis collegis suis. Qui cum Cæcilianum innocentem pronunciassent, et Donatum qui schisma Carthagini fecerat, sententia percussissent, iterum vestri ad imperatorem venerunt, de judicio episcoporum, in quo victi fuerant, murmurarunt; quomodo enim potest malus litigator laudare judices, quibus judicantibus victus est? Iterum tamen clementissimus imperator alios judices episcopos dedit apud Arelatum Galliæ civitatem; et ab ipsis vestri ad ipsum imperatorem appellarunt; donec etiam ipse causam cognosceret, et Cæcilianum innocentem, illos calumniosos pronunciaret. Aug. epist. ad Donatistas, [105, 8. p. 299. vol. II.]

The bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.

About the year of our Lord 587, [a] Johannes Nestenta, being then patriarch of Constantinople, the imperial city, in a synod gathered together in that place he endeavoured to get the name of an universal or œcumenical bishop or patriarch; [b] for which Pelagius the Second, then bishop of Rome, severely rebuked him; and Gregory the Great, Pelagius's successor, most vehemently inveighed against it, calling the name he strove for a [c] "foolish, [d] frivolous, [e] proud, [f] new,

---

[a] Ante hos siquidem annos octo, sanctæ memoriæ decessoris mei Pelagii tempore, frater et coepiscopus noster Johannes in Constantinopolitana urbe ex causa alia occasionem quærens synodum fecit, in qua se universalem appellare conatus est. Greg. regist. ad Eulogium, l. [5. ep. 43. vol. II.] Cognoscat siquidem fraternitas vestra Johannem quondam Constantinopolitanæ civitatis antistitem, &c. œcumenicum hoc est universalis sibi vocabulum usurpasse. Ibid. l. [9. ep. 68. init.]

[b] Quod beatæ recordationis Pelagius decessor noster agnoscens omnia gesta ejusdem synodi, præter illa quæ illic de causa venerandæ memoriæ Gregorii episcopi Antiocheni sunt habita, valida omnino districtione cassavit, districtissima illum increpatione corripiens, ut se a novo et temerario superstitionis nomine cohiberet: adeo ut suum illi diaconum, nisi tantum nefas emendaret, procedere prohiberet. Ibid.

[c] Eundem vero fratrem et consacerdotem meum studiose admonere curavi, ut si habere pacem omnium concordiamque desiderat, ab stulti vocabuli se appellatione compescat. Ibid. ad Mauricium Augustum, l. [7. ep. 33.]

[d] De qua re mihi in suis jussio-

[g] profane, [h] pestiferous, [i] superstitious, [k] perverse, [l] wicked, yea, a [m] blasphemous name," a name which he discoursing of breaks forth into this expression : [n] "But I confidently affirm, that whosoever calls himself or desires to be called an universal priest or bishop, is in his pride the forerunner of Antichrist, because he proudly prefers himself before others ;" a name [o] which, as he saith, none of his predecessors in the bishopric of Rome would assume unto themselves nor accept of from others.

---

nibus dominorum pietas præcepit; dicens ut pro appellatione frivoli nominis inter nos scandalum generari non debeat. Ibid.

[e] Et quia non solus ego sed tota turbatur ecclesia, quia piæ leges, quia venerandæ synodi, quia ipsa Domini nostri Jesu Christi mandata superbi atque pompatici cujusdam sermonis inventione turbantur. Ibid. ad eundem, l. [5. ep. 20.]

[f] Quis est iste, qui contra statuta evangelica, contra canonum decreta, novum sibi usurpare nomen præsumit? Ibid.

[g] Et vir sanctissimus consacerdos meus Johannes vocari universalis episcopus conatur. Exclamare compellor ac dicere, o tempora, o mores! Ecce cuncta in Europæ partibus barbarorum juri sunt tradita &c. Et tamen sacerdotes, qui in pavimento et cinere flentes jacere debuerunt, vanitatis sibi nomina expetunt, et novis ac profanis vocabulis gloriantur. Ibid.

[h] Cognoscat siquidem fraternitas vestra Johannem quondam Constantinopolitanæ civitatis antistitem, contra Deum, contra pacem ecclesiæ, in omnium conspectu et injuria sacerdotum modestiæ et mensuræ suæ terminos excessisse, et illicite in synodo superbum ac pestiferum œcumenicum hoc est universalis sibi vocabulum usurpasse. Ibid. l. [9. ep. 68.]

[i] Sed tamen de eodem superstitioso et superbo vocabulo eum admonere studui, dicens quia pacem nobiscum habere non posset, nisi elationem prædicti verbi corrigeret, quam primus apostata invenit. Ibid. ad Anastasium episcopum Antiochenum, l. [7. ep. 27.]

[k] Quis rogo in hoc tam perverso vocabulo, nisi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui despectis angelorum legionibus secum socialiter constitutis ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut et nulli subesse, et solus omnibus præesse videretur. Ibid. ad Johannem, l. 5. [ep. 18.]

[l] Ecce ex hoc nefando elationis vocabulo ecclesia scinditur. Ibid. [p. 745.] In isto enim scelesto vocabulo consentire nihil est aliud quam fidem perdere. Ibid. epist. [19.] ad Sabinianum diaconum.

[m] Sed absit a cordibus Christianorum nomen illud blasphemiæ, in quo omnium sacerdotum honor adimitur, ut ab uno sibi dementer arrogatur. Ibid. ad Mauricium Augustum, l. [5. ep. 20.]

[n] Ego autem fidenter dico quia quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit. Ibid. ad eundem, l. [7. ep. 33.]

[o] Certe pro beati Petri apostolorum principis honore per venerandam Chalcedonensem synodum Romano pontifici oblatum est. Sed nullus eorum unquam hoc singularitatis nomen assumpsit, nec uti consensit, ne dum privatum aliquid daretur uni, honore debito sacerdotes privarentur universi. Ibid. ad eundem, l. [5. ep. 20.] Sed nullus unquam decessorum meorum hoc tam profano vocabulo uti consensit. Ibid. epist. [43.] ad Eulog.

But though they that went before St. Gregory in this bishopric had refused the title of universal bishop, and himself had said so much against it, yet they that came after him both sought for it and at length attained to it. For after that Gregory and his immediate successor Sabinian (who sat in the chair not wholly two years) were dead, [p] Boniface the Third, his next successor, obtained of Phocas the emperor (and murderer of Mauritius) that the church of Rome should be called the head of all churches, and so the bishop of that place an universal or œcumenical bishop. And ever since this time hath the church of Rome pretended to an universal authority over all the churches in the world, her bishop looking upon himself as an universal bishop: but the patriarch of Constantinople still opposed it, and the contention about the preeminence was not perfectly decided till at length they agreed amongst themselves that the bishop of Constantinople should be called an universal patriarch, and the bishop of Rome an universal pope. From whence it came to pass that the title pope hath since been appropriated to the bishop of Rome, [q] which before was common to all bishops, presbyters, and clergymen whatsoever.

---

[p] Bonifacius tertius obtinuit apud Phocam principem ut sedes apostolica, B. Petri apostoli caput esset omnium ecclesiarum quia ecclesia Constantinopolitana primam se omnium ecclesiarum scribebat. Anastas. Rom. eccles. biblioth. de vita pontificum, p. 62. in vita Bonifacii. Unum porro sanxit quod laude meruit, hoc est urbem Romam totius salutaris vitæ caput esse, cum antea propter sedem principis Constantinopolis haberetur. Pompon. Læt. in Phoca, [p. 555.] Bonifacius a Phoca imp. obtinuit, magna tamen contentione, ut sedes B. Petri, quæ est caput omnium ecclesiarum, ita diceretur, et haberetur ab omnibus: quem quidem locum ecclesia Constantinopolitana sibi vendicare conabatur. Platin. in vita Bonifac. tert. [init.] Bonifacius Gregorii successor a Phoca petiit et impetravit, ut sedem Romanæ ecclesiæ caput omnium ecclesiarum statueret, quia Constantinopolitana sese omnium primam scribebat. Aimon. de gest. Franc. l. 4. [c. 4.] Cum Bonifacius tertius ab imper. Phoca impetrasset, ut in omnes episcopos prærogativam haberet, omniumque caput perpetuo foret, jam tum Romanus pontifex multo quam antea cum suo urbano sacerdotum senatu, cunctis sine controversia præstare authoritate cœpit. Polydor. Virg. de rerum inventione, l. 4. c. 9. v. et Paul diacon. histor. Longeb. l. 4. c. [37.] Flav. Blond. decad. 1. l. 9. [p. 118.]

[q] Additum ut papæ nomen, quod omnium vocabulorum episcopalium excellentius esse statutum est, solus Romanus pontifex, cum ante omnibus commune esset episcopis, retineret. Onuph. in addit. ad Plat. in vit. Bonifac. tert. [p. 67.] Papa cujusdam paternitatis nomen est et clericorum congruit dignitati. Walafr. Strabo de rebus ecclesiasticis, c. 7. Nomen *papæ*, tametsi hodie

The bishop of Rome having thus stretched his name beyond his power, he presently labours to extend his power as far as his name. And having once got the name of universal pope, he takes occasion from that to endeavour after an universal power; and for an accomplishment of his design, as the emperor's power grew weaker and weaker in the East, he made his grow stronger and stronger in the West, till at the length, about the year 680, Benedict the Second wholly shook off the emperor's jurisdiction; and afterwards, by the help of the French kings, he much enlarged the territories both of his spiritual and temporal dominion: and at the length, amongst other nations, he had got footing in England too, yea, so far, that in the days of king John he had gotten an absolute

---

apud Latinos uni Romano tribuebatur pontifici, apud priscos tamen universo presbyterorum ordini fuisse commune, non leves extant conjecturæ. Lindan. panopl. l. 4. c. 80. [p. 414.] Thus was Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, called a pope by the council at Seleucia, who, writing to the said bishop, direct their epistle, *Μακαριῷ πάπᾳ ἐπισκόπῳ ἡμῶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ διάκονοι χαίρειν*, and begin it, *Ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν ἣν ἐκ προγόνων, ἣν καὶ ἀπὸ σοῦ μεμαθήκαμεν μακάριε πάπα, ἐστὶν αὕτη.* Concil. Seleuc. in epist. ad Alexandr. apud Athanas. [p. 729. vol. I.] And so was Athanasius too, as we find in an epistle of his where it is said, *οἱ δὲ ἐπιστείλαντες, ὅτε πάπας Ἀθανάσιος, καὶ οἱ παρατυχόντες σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ.* Athanas. epist. ad Antioch. [p. 776.] Thus was St. Augustine also called a pope, and therefore St. Hierome still begins his epistles to him, Domino sancto et beatissimo papæ Augustino. Hieron. epist. ad August. inter Augustini epist. [195. vol. II.]; et domino vere sancto et omni mihi affectione venerabili papæ Augustino Hieronymus in Christo salutem. Ibid. epist. [172.]; and so elsewhere. And thus did St. Augustine call Aurelius pope, Domino beatissimo et debita observantia venerabili sinceriterque charissimo fratri et consacerdoti papæ Aurelio Augustinus in Domino salutem. Aug. epist. [60.] ad Aurelium; v. et epist. [41.] And therefore saith Alypius, in the sixth council at Carthage, Unde petimus venerationem tuam, sancte papa Aureli. Concil. Carthag. 6. c. 4. [p. 1243. vol. I.] In which council the said Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, is often called pope, whence Balsamon saith, *Ἐξῆρχε δὲ τῆς συνόδου Αὐρήλιος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Χαρκηδόνι ἐκκλησίας, ὃν καὶ πάπαν ὠνόμαζον.* Balsam. in concil. Carthag. init. p. [509. vol. I. Bever. synod.] And Clodoveus the king, writing to the first council at Orleans, ends his epistle with, Orate pro me domini sancti et apostolica sede papæ dignissimi. Concil. Aurel. 1. [p. 1008. vol. II.] v. et Sidonii epistolas, [libb. 6, 7.] ubi omnes episcopi vocantur papæ. Yea, and in Isaacius Comnenus the emperor's rule to be observed in ordination it is said, *ἤγουν ἓν μὲν ὅτε ποιεῖ αὐτὸν λιτὸν παπὰν ἤτοι ἀναγνώστην*, apud Balsam. tit. 1. de fide, cap. 34. [p. 34. comm. in can.] By all which it appears how in the primitive church the name pope was not appropriated to the bishop of Rome, as now it is; but as the pope of Rome was called a bishop as well as others, so were other bishops called popes as well as he.

surrender both of England and Ireland to himself, which were granted back again by him to the king, to hold of him and his successors in the see of Rome, in fee farm, and vassalage. And so the bishop of Rome for a while kept this nation in slavery, till at last his yoke grew so heavy that neither king nor people could endure it any longer, but both endeavoured to shake it off. And to this end were there laws made in the time of Edward I. II. III. Richard II. Henry IV. against this foreign usurpation; but it was not totally abolished till the time of Henry the VIIIth, in whose days there were several statutes made whereby all ecclesiastical as well as temporal power was reduced within his majesty's dominion, and no foreign power whatsoever suffered to have any jurisdiction in any of the territories belonging to him; which statutes were afterwards reviewed and confirmed again in the days of queen Elizabeth; and for the further confirmation of it we have it here also inserted amongst our Articles, that *the bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.* He hath no jurisdiction, neither spiritual nor temporal; and indeed if he have no spiritual he can have no temporal, his temporal jurisdiction being grounded only upon his spiritual. And therefore in speaking to this part of the article I need not insist upon his temporal, but only his spiritual or ecclesiastical power in or over this realm; for if he have no spiritual, he hath much less any temporal jurisdiction in it.

And to prove that the bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm, it will be only necessary for us to examine the title whereby he lays claim to such a jurisdiction; which is that whereby he claims the same in all Christian kingdoms over the whole world, even [r] because he is Peter's successor, and so an universal bishop, yea, the head of the whole church. But if we examine this title throughly, we shall find many flaws and defects in it, yea, such as will shew it to be of no force at all. For first, it is very questionable whether Peter was ever bishop of Rome or no; nay, it seems clear to me, that he was not bishop of that nor any one particular place else, for his commission was as large as the other apostles', even to the preaching the gospel and exercising his ministerial function in all places of the world whithersoever he should come; whereas, to make him the bishop of any one place would be to limit his power in one particular place. That Peter was at Rome, though it cannot be demonstrated from scripture, yet it being the general tenet of the ancients, I shall not deny it; but though he was there, it doth not follow that he was bishop of that place more than any other; or such a bishop as Linus, Anacletus, Clemens, and Evaristus were, and the bishops of that place now are. He might be there as an apostle, not as a mere bishop; [s] and therefore do ancient writers, in their enumeration of the bishops of Rome, not put Peter into the number of them, but begin at Linus or else at Clemens; [t] or if Peter be reckoned amongst them, yet Paul is still joined with him, and so Paul must be the bishop of Rome too as well as Peter, and so either two bishops of Rome at one time, (which they utterly deny,) or else neither of them properly bishops, such as are there now, but rather apostles, (which are sometimes called bishops too, both in scripture and other authors.) And this appears also in that there was another bishop of that place besides them ordained by themselves, to wit Linus; for so those words of Irenæus seemed clearly to intimate to us: [u] "The blessed apostle," saith he, "founding and instructing the church, delivered the administration of the episcopacy or bishopric to Linus:" so that they only founded the church, and then made another person to be the bishop of it. "And therefore," saith Ruffinus, "also [w] Linus and Cletus were bishops of Rome before Clemens, but Peter being yet alive, viz. that they might undergo the care of the episcopacy, but he fulfil the office of the apostleship. As he is found also to have done at Cæsarea, where, when himself was present, yet he ordained Zacchæus bishop of the place." So that though Peter was at Rome, yet not as the bishop of the place, but only as an apostle, unless we grant that there were more than one bishop of Rome at the same time. To which we may also add, that had Peter been bishop of the place, what need he have ordained any other to be bishop there whilst he himself was present? or to exercise that office before himself the first bishop was removed? That Linus was bishop of Rome whilst Peter himself was there cannot be denied; and therefore either there must be acknowledged two bishops of the same place, which none of the Romish party will grant, or else Peter was not bishop of the place, which is the thing we stand for. And if Peter was not the bishop of Rome, the bishops of Rome cannot be said to succeed Peter; I mean, not in the office of the bishopric. And so all their title to any ecclesiastical jurisdiction in this or any other realm, by virtue of their succession from Peter, must needs be null and void.

---

[r] Jus successionis pontificum Romanorum in eo fundatur, quod Petrus Romæ sedem suam, jubente Domino, collocarit. Bellarm. de pontif. Rom. [vol. I. l. 2.] c. 1.

---

[s] Thus we find Irenæus reckoning the first bishops of Rome: Fundantes et instruentes beati apostoli ecclesiam, Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Succedit autem ei Anacletus; post eum tertio loco ab apostolis episcopatum sortitur Clemens, qui et vidit ipsos apostolos. Iren. adv. hæres. l. 3. c. 3. [3.] Huic autem Clementi succedit Euaristus, et Euaristo Alexander, ac deinceps sextus ab apostolis constitutus est Sixtus, et ab hoc Telesphorus, qui etiam gloriosissime martyrium fecit; ac deinceps Hyginus, post Pius, post quem Anicetus. Cum autem successit Aniceto Soter, nunc duodecimo loco ab apostolis episcopatum habet Eleutherius. Ibid. So that he reckons Clemens the third, Sixtus the sixth, Eleutherius the twelfth bishop of Rome: whereas, if Peter had been one, Clemens would have been the fourth, Sixtus the seventh, and Eleutherius the thirteenth. And thus Eusebius also, Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Κλήμης τῆς Ῥωμαίων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκκλησίας τρίτος ἐπίσκοπος καταστὰς, Παύλου συνεργὸς καὶ συναθλήτης γεγονέναι πρὸς αὐτοῦ μαρτυρεῖται. Euseb. hist. eccles. l. 3. c. 4. [vol. I.] And if Clemens was the third, Linus, not Peter, was the first. And thus saith Tertullian, in carmin. contra Marcion. l. 3. [p. 891. ed. Pamelii, 1662.]

Hac cathedra, Petrus qua sederat ipse, locatum
Maxima Roma Linum, primum considere jussit.

[t] Thus are Paul and Peter often reckoned together, as founders of the church of Rome, τῆς δὲ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας μετὰ τὴν Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου μαρτυρίαν πρῶτος κληροῦται τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν Λῖνος. Euseb. hist. l. 3. c. 2. [vol. I.] Episcoporum in Roma successio hanc consequentiam habuit Petrus et Paulus, Linus, Cletus. Epiphan. [p. 107. vol. I.] A gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ. Iren. adv. hæres. l. 3. c. 3. [2.]

---

[u] Fundantes igitur et instruentes b. apostoli ecclesiam Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Ibid. [c. 3. 3.] Or as it is in Greek, *Θεμελιώσαντες δὲ καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνῳ τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν.* apud Euseb. hist. l. 5. c. 6. [vol. II.]

[w] Linus et Cletus fuerunt quidem ante Clementem episcopi in urbe Roma, sed superstite Petro, videlicet ut illi episcopatus curam gererent, ipse vero apostolatus impleret officium. Sicut invenitur etiam apud Cæsaream fecisse; ubi cum ipse esset præsens, Zachæum tamen a se ordinatum habebat episcopum. Ruffin. præfat. ad lib. recognit. [Clem. Rom. p. 398.]

But secondly, suppose we grant that Peter was bishop particularly of Rome, and so the bishop of Rome succeeded Peter in his bishopric, it doth not yet follow that he succeeds him in his apostleship too. For he was ordained an apostle by a special commission from our Saviour himself, which commission was granted to his person only, not his successors; and therefore what privileges he had by virtue of that commission were to determine with himself. Indeed, a special commission from Christ himself was so necessary to the settling any one in the office of an apostle, that when Judas was fallen by transgression from the office, the apostles themselves durst not invest another with it, but only nominating two, cast lots which should be the person, so leaving the determination of it unto God himself; whereas they of themselves ordained the bishop of Rome; which plainly shews that the bishop of Rome receiving his commission not immediately from God (as the apostles did), but only from the apostles, he never was nor is any apostle, but only a bishop. Neither do we read of any more apostles chosen after Matthias; we read indeed how the apostle James was killed by Herod, Acts xii. 2, but not of any other substituted in his place by God. No, after the apostles, who were immediately chosen by Christ himself, were dead, there was none that ever pretended to succeed them in their apostleships but the bishop of Rome; though there were several ordained bishops of such places where the apostles had in a peculiar manner exercised their apostolical function, as Peter did at Rome; for thus did [x]James sit at Jerusalem; and yet Simeon, Justus, Zacchæus, and the rest that succeeded in that bishopric, never so much as dreamed of being themselves apostles by virtue of an apostle's sitting in the place where they were bishops; yea and Peter himself sat at Antioch too, before he came to Rome, where St. Paul withstood him to the face, Gal. ii. 11, and yet [y] Evodius, Ignatius, Heros, and the succeeding bishops of that place, did never lay any claim to an universal bishopric or apostleship because Peter's successors. And how comes Rome, the younger sister, to have the apostleship settled upon her, rather than Antioch, the elder? or what respect did Peter find at Rome more than at Antioch, that he should be at Antioch before Rome, and yet prefer Rome before Antioch? It is true, he was crucified at Rome, and not at Antioch: but is that a sufficient reason why Rome rather than Antioch should have his apostleship entailed upon it? No certainly, the bishop of Antioch, or indeed any bishop, may lay claim to an apostolical commission as well as he of Rome; who having no special or immediate call from God, cannot without a solecism be termed an apostle, nor be thought to have any jurisdiction at all, without his own diocese or province, nor by consequence in this realm of England.

---

[x] *Δὴ οὖν αὐτὸν τὸν Ἰάκωβον, ὃν καὶ δίκαιον ἐπίκλην οἱ πάλαι δι' ἀρετῆς ἐκάλουν προτερήματα, πρῶτον ἱστοροῦσι τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγχειρισθῆναι θρόνον.* Euseb. hist. l. 2. c. 1. [vol. I.]; v. et l. 7. c. 19. [vol. II.]; Clem. Alex. *ὑποτυπ.* l. 6.; Chrysost. in Act. hom. 33. [vol. IV.]; Hieron. in Catalog. scriptor. eccles. in Jacob. [p. 815. vol. II.]; et August. contra Crescon. Gram. l. 2. [46. vol. IX.]

Thirdly, suppose further that the bishop of Rome be Peter's successor, it doth not yet follow that he is head of the church, or an œcumenical bishop, for that is more than Peter himself was; though he was an apostle, yet he was no more than an apostle, nor by consequence any way superior to the other apostles. He was a member of the church as well as his fellows, not the head of it above them, their fellow-servant, not their master. And therefore the apostles sent him with John to Samaria, Acts viii. 14: and certainly if he had been their master, he would not have been their messenger; had he been their head, he would not have been their feet to go up and down upon their errands. And hence also doth St. Paul say plainly, [z] *For I suppose I was not behind*

---

[y] Ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας Εὐοδίου πρώτου καταστάντος δεύτερος ἐν τοῖς δηλουμένοις Ἰγνάτιος ἐγνωρίζεται. Euseb. hist. l. [3.] κεφ. κβ': where we may also observe how, though Peter was at Antioch, yet he reckons Euodius the first bishop.

[z] The vulgar Latin is here far from rendering the right sense of the original; for whereas it is in Greek, Λογίζομαι γὰρ μηδὲν ὑστερηκέναι τῶν ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀποστόλων, the vulgar hath it, *Existimo enim nihil me minus fecisse a magnis apostolis*: how much nearer to the words comes our translation, *And I suppose I was not behind the very chiefest apostles*; according to which sense the Syriac

the very chiefest of the apostles, 2 Cor. xi. 5; *For in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles*, chap. xii. 11. So that St. Paul did not look upon himself as any way inferior to any of the apostles; no not to Peter himself; and therefore when Peter did amiss, (for it seems Peter could err, though the pope cannot,) St. Paul *withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed*, Gal. ii. 11; intimating that he [a]reproved, yea and resisted Peter himself; which certainly he would never have done had he been the head of the church, and so his superior. Nay, St. Paul did not only look upon St. Peter as his equal, but St. Peter looked upon St. Paul as his superior; for, saith St. Paul, *When James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave unto me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go to the heathen, and they to the circumcision*, ver. 9. So that Peter was so far from accounting himself to be above all, that he doth himself give the right hand of fellowship to St. Paul and Barnabas; and therefore, whatsoever the church of Rome would make of Peter now, be sure he never took himself for the head of the church, but only as a fellow worker with the other apostles; and therefore we may well say with Cyprian[b], "What Peter was, that was also the other apostles, endowed with the like fellowship of honour and power."

But Peter's supremacy being the foundation of the pope's

---

also translates the words too, ܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ; ܓܝܪ ܕܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܒܨܪܬ ܡܢ ܫܠܝܚܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܡܝܬܪܝܢ that is (not as the Latin translation hath it, *Arbitror enim nihil me minus præstitisse quam apostoli illi admodum præstantes*, but), *I suppose I am in nothing less than the apostles, which are most excellent;* plainly intimating that there was none of the apostles above St. Paul, nor by consequence any of them the head of the church more than he; for then he must needs have come behind him. Where Œcumenius observes he saith, οὐδὲν ὑστέρησα, οὐδὲ ἐνέλιπον, ἢ κατόπιν ἦλθον τῶν περὶ Πέτρον. Œcum. in loc. [p. 700. vol. I.] and St. Chrysostome, οὐκέτι πρὸς ἐκείνους, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ποιούμενος τὴν σύγκρισιν. Chrysost. in loc. [p. 668, 16. vol. III.]

[a] So the Syriac renders ܒܐܦܘܗܝ ܐܟܣܬܗ *I reproved him before his face;* and St. Chrysostome, Διὸ καὶ Παῦλος ἐπιπλήττει, καὶ Πετρὸς ἀνέχεται, ἵνα ἐγκαλουμένου τοῦ διδασκάλου καὶ σιγῶντος, εὐκολώτερον οἱ μαθηταὶ μεταθῶνται. Chrysost. in loc. [p. 730, 38. ibid.]

[b] Hoc erant utique et cæteri apostoli quod Petrus, pari consortio præditi, et honoris et potestatis. Cyprian. de unit. eccles. [p. 107.]

authority, to uphold this they bring every thing that hath but the face of an argument to maintain that; well knowing that if the apostle Peter was but equal to the other apostles, the bishop of Rome cannot be thought to have jurisdiction over other bishops; and therefore, for the further confirmation of this truth, it will be necessary to examine what they have to say against it. Now the Goliath which these Philistines send forth to defy the army of the Israelites, the principal argument they bring to prove Peter's supremacy over the other apostles, and so the pope's authority over the whole church, is the words of our Saviour to the same apostle, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church*, Matt. xvi. 18. From whence they would persuade us that Peter was appointed by our Saviour to be the foundation of the whole church. But surely, while they force such a gloss upon that place of scripture, they quite forget what St. Paul saith, *For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ*, 1 Cor. iii. 11; so that whatsoever sense they put upon the words, certainly it is the next door to blasphemy to take away Christ from being the foundation of the church, and to thrust Peter into his place; to take away Christ that purchased his church with his own blood, and to put in Peter that most shamefully denied Christ; to take away Christ that conquered Satan, and to put in him to whom Christ saith in the same chapter, *Get thee behind me, Satan.* In a word, what is if this be not blasphemy, to say not he who is the chief corner stone, 1 Pet. ii. 6, but he who was a rock of offence to Christ, Matt. xvi. 23, is the foundation of the church of Christ.

But, for my own part, I cannot but admire how these words came at first to be wrested to such a sense, which of themselves they can by no means bear; for our Saviour doth not say, Thou art Peter, and upon thee I will build my church, but, *Thou art Peter, and* [c] *upon this rock will I build my church*;

---

[c] To evade the force of the words *upon this rock*, the papists Bellarmine, Maldonate, Petrus de Bollo, and others, object it was not the Greek but Syriac language, wherein our Saviour spoke these words to Peter, in which language כיפא signifies both Peter and a stone, without any change of the gender. To which I answer, I. It is true our Saviour spoke these words not in the Greek but Syriac language; but howso-

viz. upon him whom thou hast now confessed to be the Son of God, or upon this confession which thou hast made of him. And howsoever the church of Rome may force another sense upon the words, certainly this is the exposition which the primitive church gave of them. Some of the Fathers expressly avouching Christ himself to be the rock here understood, others Peter's confession of Christ and faith in him; all which come to one and the same thing; therefore saith St. Augustine, [d] "Christ is the foundation in the structure of a wise architect." This wants no exposition; for it is plainly said, *For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Christ;* but if Christ, then without doubt the faith of Christ, for Christ dwells in our hearts by faith; so that to say Christ, or faith in Christ, or Peter's confession of him, all comes to one and the same thing, all of them making Christ still, not Peter, to be the rock upon which the church is built.

Let these of the Fathers speak for the rest. [e] "The Lord,"

---

ever St. Matthew wrote them not in Syriac but in Greek, and therefore it is the Greek that is the original, not the Syriac. But, 2. it is plainly false that כיפא signifies both Peter and a stone without the change of the gender, or in the same gender. For that כיפא as it denotes Peter is of the masculine gender, I hope they will not deny (unless they will make Peter such a one as his pretended successor Joan was), whereas כיפא for a stone or rock is always of the feminine, as ܘܢܣܒ ܝܥܩܘܒ ܟܐܦܐ ܘܐܩܝܡܗ̇ *Et Jacob accepit Cepha et erexit eam,* Gen. xxxi. 45. so, ܟܐܦܐ ܒܚܝܪܬܐ ܩܪܢܝܬܐ ܝܩܝܪܬܐ *Cepha probata, angularis, pretiosa,* Isai. xxviii. 16. ܟܐܦܐ ܪܒܐ ܗܘܬ; *Cepha magna erat,* Mar. xvi. 4, and so elsewhere. Nay, 3. in this very place too כיפא, when spoken of Peter whose name it was, is of the masculine, but when used for a rock or stone is of the feminine gender, ܘܥܠ ܗܕܐ ܟܐܦܐ *et super hanc Cepha,* non *hunc,* for then it should have been ܗܢܐ not ܗܕܐ, which is a pronoun of the feminine gender. And therefore it is in vain to seek any elusion of the place from the Syriac, that being as plain against them as the Greek; for as in the Greek Πέτρος and πέτρα are of different genders, so are the first and second ܟܐܦܐ in Syriac of different genders too.

[d] Fundamentum Christus est in structura architecti sapientis: hoc expositione non indiget. Aperte enim dictum est, *Fundamentum enim aliud nemo potest ponere præter id quod positum est, quod est Christus Jesus.* Si autem Christus, proculdubio fides Christi. Per fidem quippe habitat Christus in cordibus nostris. Aug. de fide et operibus, [27. vol. VI.]

[e] Dominus est petra fidei, tanquam fundamentum, ut ipse Dominus ait ad principem apostolorum, *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam,* super confessionem videlicet Christi, quia dixerat: *Tu es Christus filius Dei viventis.* Greg. Nyssen. testim. contra Judæos, c. ult. [p. 162. vol. II.]

saith Gregory Nyssen, "is the rock of faith, as the foundation, as the Lord himself saith to the chief of the apostles, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church*, viz. upon the confession of Christ; for he had said, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.*" St. Augustine; [f] "Thou art therefore," saith he, "Peter, and upon this rock which thou hast confessed, upon this rock which thou hast acknowledged, saying, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God*, will I build my church, I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee." And again; [g] "For therefore saith the Lord, *Upon this rock will I build my church*, because Peter had said, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;* upon this rock therefore, saith he, which thou hast confessed, will I build my church. That rock was Christ, upon which foundation Peter himself is also built." And again; [h] "What means that, *Upon this rock will I build my church?* Upon this faith, upon that which was said, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.*" [i] "And upon this rock," saith St. Chrysostome, "I will build my church, that is, upon the faith of this confession." And again; [k] "Upon this rock; he did not say upon Peter, for he did not build his church upon a man, but upon faith; but what faith was it? *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.*" And St. Jerome; [l] "By the rock we signify Christ; for if we take Peter for a fundamental rock, the other apostles would be as much as he, as we read in the Revelations of John." Basil of Seleucia; [m] "Christ calling his confession a rock named him Peter that first acknowledged it." [n] "Let us see," saith Eusebius Emissenus, "what this means, *And upon this rock will I build my church:* Upon this rock which thou even now confessedst, saying, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,* upon this rock and upon this faith will I build my church." [o] "Wherefore," saith St. Ambrose, "the Lord saith to Peter, *Upon this rock I will build my church;* that is, in this confession of the catholic faith I appoint believers to life." Yea, and pope Adrian himself the first[p], "Upon this rock which thou hast confessed, and from which thou obtainedst the dignity of thy name, upon this soundness of faith, I will build my church." And Felix the Third, [q] "Upon this confession will I build my church." So unanimous were the fathers of the primitive church in striking at the foundation of the pope's supremacy. For it is upon this place it is chiefly built; which being not to be understood of Peter's person, but his confession, or rather not of Peter that confessed Christ, but of Christ whom Peter confessed, neither Peter nor his successors can claim any jurisdiction in this or any other Christian realms from these words.

---

[f] Tu es ergo, inquit, Petrus; et super hanc petram quam confessus es, super hanc petram quam cognovisti, dicens, *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi*, ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Super me ædificabo te, non me super te. Aug. de verbis Domini, sec. Mat. serm. [76. 1. vol. V.]

[g] Ideo quippe ait Dominus, *Super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam*, quia dixerat Petrus, *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi:* super hanc ergo, inquit, petram, quam confessus es, ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Petra erat Christus: super quod fundamentum etiam ipse ædificatus est Petrus. Id. in Joh. tract. 124. [5. par. ii. vol. III.]

[h] Quid est, *super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam?* Super hanc fidem, super id quod dictum est, *Tu es Christus filius Dei viventis.* Id. in epist. Joh. tract. 10. [1. ibid.]

[i] *Καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· τουτέστι, τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας.* Chrysost. in Mat. hom. 54. [p. 344, 19. vol. II.]

[k] *Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ. Οὐκ εἶπεν, ἐπὶ τῷ πέτρῳ· οὔτε γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ τὴν πίστιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ᾠκοδόμησε. Τί δὲ ἦν ἡ πίστις; σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.* Id. hom. de pentecoste 1. tom. V. p. 979. [4.]

[l] Per petram significamus Christum quem Petrus confessus est. Nam si capiamus Petrum pro petra fundamentali, æque essent et cæteri apostoli, sicut legimus in apoc. Johannis. Hieron. in loc.

Another foundation they would ground Peter's primacy, and so the pope's supremacy upon, is the verse following the words we have already cleared from their false glosses; viz. *And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and*

---

[m] *Ταύτην τὴν ὁμολογίαν πέτραν καλέσας ὁ Χριστὸς, Πέτρον ὀνομάζει τὸν πρώτως ταύτην ὁμολογήσαντα.* Basil. Seleuc. in loc. [orat. 25. p. 142.]

[n] Videamus quid sit; *et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam:* super hanc petram, quam tu modo docuisti, dicens: *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi.* Super hanc petram et super hanc fidem ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Euseb. Emis. hom. in natal. S. Petri, [p. 795. vol. VI. Max. Bibl. Patr.]

[o] Unde dicit Dominus ad Petrum; *Super istam petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam,* hoc est, in hac catholicæ fidei confessione statuo fideles ad vitam. Ambros. in Eph. c. 2. [p. 236. app. vol. II.]

[p] Super hanc petram, quam confessus es, et a qua vocabuli sortitus es dignitatem, super hanc soliditatem fidei ecclesiam meam ædificabo. Adrian. prim. epist. ad episcop. Gal. et Hispan. [p. 867. vol. IV. conc. Hard.]

[q] *Καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.* Felix papa tert. epist. ad Zen. August. apud Gennad. pro concil. Florent. c. 5. [p. 828. vol. II. ibid.]

whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Matt. xvi. 19. From which words they conclude that the power of the keys was granted only to Peter; not considering that what is here said to Peter in the singular is elsewhere spoken to all the disciples in the plural number; *Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven*, Matth. xviii. 18: and, *Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained*, John xx. 23. So that the power of the keys was not only committed to Peter, but to all the disciples, and so not to the pope only, but to all ministers rightly ordained. [r] "For all the apostles," saith St. Jerome, "received the keys of the kingdom of heaven." And [s] "what is it else," saith Pacianus, "that he saith to the apostles, *Whatsoever ye bind on earth*," &c.: so that it was not to Peter only, but to all the apostles that these words were said. "And therefore," saith Augustine, [t] "the church which is founded in Christ received in Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven from him, that is, power to bind and loose sins." And St. Basil; [u] "And he gave the like power to all pastors and masters, which appears in that all bind and loose alike as well as he," viz. Peter. And St. Cyprian; [w] "Christ after his resurrection gave the like power to all his apostles, and said, *As my Father hath sent me, so send I you: Receive the Holy Ghost: if you remit to any his sins, they are remitted unto him: if you retain them, they shall be retained.*" Theophylact; [x] "For those that after Peter are thought worthy of the episcopal grace have power to loose and bind. For though it be said to Peter only *I will give to thee*, yet the same power was given to all the apostles, when he said, *Whose soever sins ye remit shall be remitted*." Leo the First; [y] "This power of the keys is translated also to all the apostles and presidents of the church. But the reason why it was commended singly to Peter was because the example of Peter was propounded to all the pastors of the church." To name no more; [z] "It is to be noted," saith Anselme, "that this power was not given to Peter only, but as Peter answered one for all, so in Peter he gave this power to all." By which cloud of witnesses it evidently appears, that this place makes as little for them as the other, Peter having no greater share in the power of the keys than the other apostles had.

---

[r] Cuncti apostoli claves regni cælorum accipiunt. Hieron. adv. Jovinian. l. 1. [26. vol. II.]

[s] Quid est aliud quod apostolis dicit, *Quæ ligaveritis in terris ligata erunt in cælis*, &c. Pacian. ad Sympron. ep. 1. [p. 306. vol. IV. Max. Bibl. Patr.]

[t] Ecclesia ergo, quæ fundatur in Christo, claves ab eo regni cælorum accepit in Petro, id est, potestatem ligandi solvendique peccata. Aug. in Joh. tract. 124. [5. par. ii. vol. III.]

[u] Καὶ πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐφεξῆς ποιμέσι καὶ διδασκάλοις, τὴν ἴσην παρέχοντος ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τούτου σημεῖον, τὸ δεσμεῖν ἅπαντας ὁμοίως, καὶ λύειν, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος. Basil. Constitut. monast. reg. 22. [p. 792. vol. II.]

[w] Christus apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuit et dicit: *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos; Accipite Spiritum S. Si cui remiseritis peccata, remittentur ei, si cui retinueritis, tenebuntur.* Cyprian. de unitate ecclesiæ, [p. 107.]

The third and last place they bring for the pope's supremacy (for all their other places are not worth naming) is that in St. John, *He saith unto him*, (Peter,) *Feed my sheep*, John xxi. 16; from whence they argue, that Peter only had the care of the church committed to his charge; whereas in the chapter before, our Saviour saith to all his apostles, *As my Father sent me, so send I you*, John xx. 21. What did he send them to do? why, *Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, Matth. xxviii. 19. So that not only Peter, but all the apostles were to preach the gospel, and to look to the settlement and propagation of the church. And therefore saith St. Cyprian, [a] "All are pastors, but only one flock is shewn, which is with an unanimous consent fed by all the apostles." And St. Augustine; [b] "Christ commended his lambs to Peter, who did himself feed Peter. Therefore, my brethren, hear with obedience, that ye are all Christ's sheep, because we also hear with trembling, *Feed my sheep*." So that St. Augustine looked upon that command as laid upon him and other ministers as well as Peter. Many more testimonies I might produce to this purpose, but these may suffice for the present, to shew, that as not the power of the keys, so neither was the care of the church committed to Peter only, but that other apostles then as well as Peter, and other ministers now as well as the pope, are to feed the sheep of Christ, the Shepherd of our souls. And therefore, that the pope cannot by virtue of these places of scripture before mentioned, nor by consequence of any other, (these being the principal,) claim any power or jurisdiction over any churches out of his own province, and by consequence not in this realm.

---

[x] Ἔχουσι γὰρ ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι καὶ δεσμεῖν οἱ κατὰ Πέτρον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀξιωθέντες χάριτος. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ πρὸς Πέτρον μόνον εἴρηται τὸ δώσω σοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀποστόλοις δέδοται· πότε; ὅτε εἶπεν ἂν τινῶν ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφίενται. Theophylact. in Mat. xvi. [p. 94.]

[y] Hæc clavium potestas ad omnes etiam apostolos et ecclesiæ præsules est translata. Quod autem sigillatim Petro sit commendata, ideo factum est quod Petri exemplum universis ecclesiæ pastoribus fuit propositum. Leo serm. de nativ.

[z] Notandum est, quod hæc potestas non solum Petro data est, sed sicut Petrus unus pro omnibus respondit, sic in Petro omnibus hanc potestatem dedit. Anselm. in loc. [p. 89.]

[a] Pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur. Cyprian. de unitate ecclesiæ, [p. 195. ed. Bened.]

Neither is this assertion, that "the bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm," contrary to the custom and practice of the primitive church, especially for the first six hundred years after Christ; in all which time, as the bishop of Rome was not termed an universal pope, so neither did he exercise an universal power. For the confirmation of which we may take notice of these following canons of the ancient and most renowned councils. As first, the first and famous council at Nice, [c] "Let ancient customs be observed, in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, so that the bishop of Alexandria have authority over all those places; because the same custom is observed by the bishop of Rome too. And so likewise in Antioch and other provinces, let the dignities and privileges be preserved to the churches.” [d] “Which canon,” as Balsamon saith, “and the seventh determined that the patriarchs, to wit of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem be honoured according to the ancient customs, and that he of Alexandria be over the provinces of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. He of Antioch also over Syria, Cœlesyria, Mesopotamia, and both Cilicias; he of Jerusalem over the provinces of Palestine, Arabia, and Phœnice, as they say the bishop of Rome is also over the western provinces.” Whence we may observe from this council, 1. that the bishop of Rome hath no other authority over the churches near him, than the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem have over those near them; and so, 2. that in the judgment of this renowned council, the bishop of Rome is no universal bishop, nor head over the whole church, there being other bishops that have as much to do in one part of the church as he in another. 3. That what authority he hath it is not of divine right, but only of custom, as the words of the canons expressly declare.

---

[b] Commendabat Christus agnos suos Petro qui pascebat et Petrum. Ergo fratres cum obedientia audite oves vos esse Christi, quia et nos cum timore audimus *Pasce oves meas*. Aug. de verb. Dom. serm. [146, 1. vol. V.]

[c] Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθές ἐστιν. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιοχείαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Conc. Nic. can. 6. [p. 325. vol. I. Conc. Hard.]

The next general council was held at Constantinople, and determined [e] “that the bishops of any diocese should not go to any churches beyond their limits or diocese, nor confound the churches; but that according to the canons the bishop of Alexandria look to the church affairs in Egypt only; and the bishops of the east govern the east only, the privileges granted to the church of Antioch by the canons of the Nicene council being preserved. And that the bishops of the Asian diocese administer the ecclesiastical affairs in Asia only; they of Pontus in Pontus only; and they of Thracia in Thracia only. But that no bishop, unless he be called, go out of his own diocese for ordination, or any other ecclesiastical administration. But the canon concerning the dioceses being observed, it is plain that, according to the determination of the Nicene council, the council of the province administer and govern every province." Whence we may learn, 1. that no bishop is to exercise any authority out of his own province or diocese, and by consequence not the bishop of Rome; 2. that in case the bishops particularly cannot decide any controversy, the bishops of the province where it is started must end it, without any appeals to him of Rome. But Constantine having now removed his court from Rome to Byzantium, (from whom it was afterwards called Constantinople,) this council determined also [f] "that the bishops of Constantinople have the privilege of honour next after the bishop of Rome, because it is now new Rome;" which shews that the bishop of Rome was so much honoured only because it was the emperor's seat, and that the honour still followed the emperor: so that when he was removed to Byzantium, a city of no great note before, nor mentioned in the Nicene council as having any patriarch belonging to it, yet the emperor seating himself there, there is not only a patriarch ordained of the place, but he is preferred before Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, and is placed next to Rome, who is therefore placed first, because the emperor's seat was still there.

---

[d] Ὁ παρὼν κανὼν καὶ ὁ ζʹ διορίζονται τούς τε πατριάρχας, δηλαδὴ τὸν Ῥώμης, τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας, τὸν Ἀντιοχείας, καὶ τὸν Ἱεροσολύμων κατὰ τὰ πάλαια ἔθη τιμᾶσθαι, καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἀλεξανδρείας προέχειν τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ Λιβύῃ, καὶ Πενταπόλει ἐπαρχιῶν. Τὸν Ἀντιοχείας ὁμοίως τῆς Συρίας, τῆς Κοίλης Συρίας, τῆς Μεσοποταμίας, καὶ ἑκατέρας Κιλικίας· τὸν δὲ Ἱεροσολύμων τῶν ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ ἐπαρχιῶν, τῶν ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ, καὶ τῶν ἐν Φοινίκῃ, ὅτι φησὶ καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ῥώμης προέχει τῶν ἑσπερίων ἐπαρχιῶν. Balsam. in loc. [p. 66. Bever. Synod. vol. I.]

[e] Τοὺς ὑπὲρ διοίκησιν ἐπισκόπους ταῖς ὑπερορίοις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἐπιέναι, μηδὲ συγχέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας· ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τὸν μὲν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μόνον οἰκονομεῖν· τούς τε τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπους τὴν ἀνατολὴν μόνον διοικεῖν· φυλαττομένων τῶν ἐν τοῖς κανόσι τοῖς κατὰ Νίκαιαν πρεσβείων τῇ Ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίᾳ. Καὶ τούς τε Ἀσιανῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπους τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσιανὴν μόνον οἰκονομεῖν· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ποντικῆς τὰ τῆς Ποντικῆς μόνα· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Θρᾳκικῆς τὰ τῆς Θρᾳκικῆς μόνον οἰκονομεῖν. Ἀκλήτους δὲ ἐπισκόπους ὑπὲρ διοίκησιν μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν ἐπὶ χειροτονίᾳ, ἢ τίσιν ἄλλαις οἰκονομίαις ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς. Φυλαττομένου δὲ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου περὶ τῶν διοικήσεων κανόνος, εὔδηλον ὡς τὰ καθ᾽ ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἡ τῆς ἐπαρχίας σύνοδος διοικήσει, κατὰ τὰ ἐν Νικαίᾳ ὡρισμένα. Concil. Constantinop. 1. can. 2. [p. 809. vol. I.]

To this purpose also makes the twenty-eighth canon of the fourth general council, viz. at Chalcedon: [g] "In all things following the determinations of the holy Fathers, and acknowledging the canon lately read of the hundred and fifty holy bishops, we also decree and appoint the same things concerning the privileges of the most holy church at Constantinople, new Rome. For the Fathers did likewise give privileges to the throne of old Rome, because that city obtained the empire. And the hundred and fifty holy bishops, (in the second general council,) moved with the same reason, granted the like privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome; rightly judging, that the city which is honoured with the empire and senate, and enjoyeth the same privileges with the old queen Rome, should also be magnified in ecclesiastical affairs as highly as she, being the second after her." Where we may take notice, 1. how the bishop of Constantinople hath as great power and privileges in ecclesiastical affairs as he of Rome, only placed after it; and so the bishop of Rome no universal bishop. 2. That here also it is expressly delivered that the reason why the bishopric of Rome was so highly exalted in former times above others, was not because Peter sat there, but because the emperor sat there. And this canon was also afterwards confirmed again in the sixth general council. [h] "Renewing," say they, "the determinations of the hundred and fifty holy Fathers assembled in this divinely preserved and royal city, and the six hundred and thirty gathered together in Chalcedon, we determine also that the throne of Constantinople receive equal privileges with the throne of old Rome, and be magnified and accounted in ecclesiastical affairs as high as it, being the second after it: after which is

---

[f] Τὸν μὲν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην. Ibid. can. 3.

[g] Πανταχοῦ τοῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὅροις ἑπόμενοι, καὶ τὸν ἀρτίως ἀναγνωσθέντα κανόνα τῶν ἕκατον πεντήκοντα θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων γνωρίζοντες, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁρίζομέν τε καὶ ψηφιζόμεθα περὶ τῶν πρεσβείων τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας τῆς αὐτῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης. Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα. Καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ἕκατον πεντή-

---

κοντα θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες, τὴν βασιλείᾳ καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν, καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς, ὡς ἐκείνην, μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν. Concil. Chalced. can. 28. [pp. 612, 613. vol. II.]

[h] *Ἀνανεούμενοι τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν τῇ θεοφυλάκτῳ ταύτῃ καὶ βασιλίδι πόλει συνελθόντων, καὶ τῶν ἑξακοσίων τριάκοντα τῶν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι συναθροισθέντων νομοθετηθέντα, ὁρίζομεν, ὥστε τὸν Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως θρόνον τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαβεῖν πρεσβείων τοῦ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης θρόνου, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκεῖνον μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, δεύτερον μετ' ἐκεῖνον ὑπάρχοντα· μεθ' ὃν ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων μεγαλοπόλεως, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον ὁ τῆς Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν πόλεως.* Concil. Trul. can. 36. [p. 1675. vol. III.]

the throne of Alexandria; and after that of Jerusalem." So that still the bishop of Constantinople is of equal power and authority with him of Rome; and therefore the bishop of Rome no more the head of the church than he of Constantinople, and the patriarch of Constantinople may as well claim jurisdiction in this realm as the bishop of Rome.

But there was another passage in this the sixth general council also that makes much against the bishop of Rome's authority; for here Honorius by name, bishop of Rome, was condemned for a heretic. For in the acts of the same council it is expressly said, [i]"But with these, viz. Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Petrus, bishops of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, Theodorus of Pharan, with these we saw that Honorius, who was bishop of old Rome, be cast out of the catholic church, and anathematized, because we find by writings from him to Sergius, that in all things he followed his judgment and confirmed his wicked opinions." And in the first canon of the said council it is said, the sixth general council condemned [k]"such as disturbed and adulterated the right doctrine of faith, and teach the people one will and one operation in our Lord Jesus Christ; we mean Theodorus the bishop of Pharan, Cyrus the bishop of Alexandria, Honorius the bishop of Rome, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Petrus, bishops of this city," &c.; and in the epistle of Leo the Second to Constantine, [l]"We also anathematize the inventors of the new errors, viz. Theodorus bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria,

---

[i] Cum his vero simul projici a sancta Dei catholica ecclesia, simulque anathematizari prævidimus, et Honorium, qui fuerat papa antiquæ Romæ, eo quod invenimus per scripta, quæ ab eo facta sunt ad Sergium, quia in omnibus mentem ejus secutus est, et impia dogmata confirmavit. Concil. Trul. act. 13. [p. 1334. ibid.]

[k] Τούς τε εὐθὲς τῆς ἀληθείας δόγμα παραχαραξάντας, καὶ ἓν θέλημα, καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοὺς λαοὺς ἐκδιδάξαντας τῇ τῆς εὐσεβείας ψήφῳ καταδικάσασα· φαμὲν Θεόδωρον τὸν τῆς Φαρὰν, Κῦρον τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας, Ὡνόριον τὸν Ῥώμης, Σέργιον Πύρρον, Παῦλον, Πέτρον, τοὺς ἐν τῇ ταύτῃ θεοφυλάκτῳ προεδρεύσαντας πόλει. Ibid. can. 1. [p. 1657.]

[l] Pariterque anathematizamus novi erroris inventores, id est, Theodorum Pharanitanum episcopum, Cyrum Alexandrinum, Sergium, Pyrrhum, Paulum, Petrum Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ successores, magis quam præsules, nec non et Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicæ traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est. Leo sec. epist. ad Constant. inter act. concil. Trul. [p. 1475. ibid.]

Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Petrus, successors rather than governors of the church of Constantinople, and Honorius also, who adorned not this apostolical church with doctrine of apostolical tradition, but by profane treachery endeavoured to subvert the unspotted faith." From all which it is clear, 1. that the bishop of Rome is not infallible, and by consequence no successor of St. Peter in his apostolical privileges; for here we see Honorius, a bishop of that place, is condemned for monothelicism; as Eleutherius, Liberius, Anastasius the Second, John the Twenty-second, and many other of the bishops of that place, were tainted with other heresies. 2. Here we may also see that the bishop of Rome is not the head of the church; for if he had, certainly so many learned men as there were met together would not have presumed to have passed such a sentence upon him. But we see they make no more of him than they did of the other heretics, even condemned him for joining with them.

But that the bishop of Rome had not so much authority in the primitive church as he pretends now, is clear also in that appeals were not to be made to him. For besides that Donatus appealed both from him and a whole council too to the emperor, as we saw in the foregoing part of this article, the council at Antioch expressly decreed, [m]"That if any bishop, being accused of certain faults, be judged by all the bishops in the province, and all unanimously pass the same sentence upon him; let him not be judged any more by others, but let the unanimous sentence of the bishops of the province remain firm." And the second council at Milevi, [n]"It pleaseth us also that bishops, deacons, and other inferior clergymen, in any causes which they shall have, if they complain of the judgments of their own bishops, let the neighbour bishops hear them. But if they think also that appeal should be made from them, let them not appeal, but only to the African councils, or the primates of their provinces. But whosoever shall think that appeals should be made to any foreign power, or beyond the seas, let them not be received by any into communion within Africa." And if all causes must be determined in the province where they rise, and no foreign power must be appealed to, then certainly not the bishop of Rome, unless the question arise in his own province. And this is that which was determined also in the council of Nice, the fifth canon whereof is, [o] "Concerning those as are excommunicated, either of the clergy or laity, by the bishops of every province, let this rule be observed, according to the canon that pronounceth, that they that are excommunicated by some bishops do not go to others. But let it be examined whether it be for hatred, contention, or any other fault of the bishop, that they are excommunicated; for the better examination of which, it seemeth well that in each province twice a year councils meet; that all the bishops of the province meeting together, such questions may be examined; and so they that have evidently offended their bishop, may seem to all justly excommunicated, until it shall seem good to the bishops to pass a milder sentence upon them." Where we may take notice, 1. that they that are excommunicated by the bishops of one province ought not to appeal to the bishops of any other province whatsoever, and by consequence not to the bishop of Rome; 2. that all questions should be determined in the province where they arise; 3. that such persons as are excommunicated be so accounted by all till the bishops themselves, by whom they were excommunicated, receive them into the church again, no respect at all being had in this particular to the bishop of Rome more than to other bishops.

---

[m] Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπὶ τίσιν ἐγκλήμασι κατηγορηθεὶς, κριθείη ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων, πάντες τε σύμφωνοι μίαν κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐξενέγκοιεν ψῆφον· τοῦτον μηκέτι παρ᾽ ἑτέροις δικάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μένειν βεβαίαν τὴν σύμφωνον τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων ἀπόφασιν. Concil. Antioch. can. 15. [p. 599. vol. I.]

[n] Item placuit ut episcopi, diaconi, vel cæteri inferiores clerici, in causis quas habuerint, si de judiciis episcoporum suorum quæsti fuerint, vicini episcopi eos audiant; et inter eos quicquid est finiant, adhibiti ab eis ex consensu episcoporum suorum. Quod si et ab iis provocandum putaverint, non provocent, nisi ad Africana concilia, vel ad primates provinciarum suarum. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverint appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiatur. Concil. Milevit. 2. cap. 22. [p. 1221. ibid.]

---

[o] Περὶ τῶν ἀκοινωνήτων γενομένων, εἴτε τῶν ἐν κλήρῳ εἴτε τῶν λαϊκῷ τάγματι, ὑπὸ τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπων, κρατείτω ἡ γνώμη κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν διαγορεύοντα, τοὺς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθέντας, ὑφ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσιέσθαι. Ἐξεταζέσθω δὲ, μὴ μικροψυχίᾳ, ἢ φιλονεικίᾳ, ἤ τινι τοιαύτῃ ἀηδίᾳ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἀποσυνάγωγοι γεγένηνται· ἵνα οὖν τοῦτο τὴν πρέπουσαν ἐξέτασιν λαμβάνῃ, καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξεν, ἑκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν δὶς τοῦ ἔτους συνόδους γίνεσθαι· ἵνα κοινῇ πάντων τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναγομένων, τὰ τοιαῦτα ζητήματα ἐξετάζοιτο· καὶ οὕτως οἱ ὁμολογουμένως προσκεκρουκότες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, κατὰ λόγον ἀκοινώνητοι παρὰ πᾶσιν εἶναι δόξωσι, μέχρις ἂν τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἐπισκόπων δόξῃ τὴν φιλανθρωποτέραν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐκθέσθαι ψῆφον. Concil. Nic. I. can. 5. [pp. 324, 5. ibid.]

For the further clearing of this particular, we have also a remarkable passage in the sixth council of Carthage, an. Dom. 419; for the African bishops having deposed Celestius and Apiarius for certain crimes objected against them, they presently appeal from them to Zosimus then bishop of Rome, who, contrary to the Nicene decree before recited, restores them again; and for the better confirmation of this his restitution, the said bishop sends legates, viz. Faustinus, a bishop, Phillipius and Asellus, priests, with the foresaid Apiarius, to the council then met at Carthage, to prevail with the said council for their restitution of him also; and for the better accomplishing of his design, he ordered them to plead, that the first council of Nice decreed, that appeals should be made to the bishop of Rome, who might send priests from his side for the decision of the controversy. The legates being come to the council, and their orders being read, the council unanimously agreed, that in [p] their copies of the council of Nice there was no such thing as that appeals should be made to the bishop of Rome, as he pleaded. But, howsoever, for their fuller satisfaction in that particular, they hasted messengers away to Constantinople and Alexandria, for the true and authentic copies of the said council. Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, and Cyril, of Alexandria, answer their desires. The councils having gotten the true Greek copies of the Nicene canons, they consult them too, but still find no such thing as the bishop of Rome pleaded, upon which they send to Celestinus, then bishop of Rome, (for Zosimus, before spoken of, yea, and Boniface too, his immediate successor, by this time were dead, and Celestinus sat in the chair, to whom the council of Carthage sends word,) amongst other things, saying: [q] "After our due salutation of you, we desire that hereafter you would not easily admit such as come from hence to your ears, nor hereafter receive into communion such as are excommunicated by us; for your worship may easily perceive, that this was also defined by the council at Nice." And presently; [r] "And the Nicene decrees did most clearly commit both the clergy of lower degree and the bishops themselves to the metropolitans; for they saw most prudently and justly, that all businesses should be ended in the places where they began; and that the grace of the Holy Ghost is not wanting to every province." And again; [s] "Or how can any foreign judgment stand good, to which the necessary witnesses, either by reason of the infirmity of their sex, or age, or many other impediments intervening, cannot be brought; for that any should be sent from your holiness's side, we do not find it appointed by any synod."

---

[p] Quamvis enim plurimos codices legerimus, sed nunquam in Nicæno concilio in Latinis codicibus legimus, quemadmodum in supradicto commonitorio inde directa sunt: tamen quia hic in nullo codice Græco ea potuimus invenire, ex orientalibus ecclesiis, ubi perhibentur eadem decreta posse etiam authentica reperiri, magis nobis desideramus afferri. Epist. concil. Afric. ad Bonifac. [p. 943. vol. I.]

Now in this passage of this African or Carthaginian council there are these things worthy our observation: 1. that no less than three bishops of Rome, one after another, knew no divine right for the authority or jurisdiction of that bishopric over others; for here we see they are forced to fly to the constitution of a council for the confirmation of it, whereas had they thought that those words, *Upon this rock will I build my church*, or any other text of scripture, made any thing for it, they would never have run to a council for the proving of it. 2. That a whole council of famous bishops, amongst whom were Augustinus, Aurelius, and above two hundred others, though certainly well skilled in scripture, yet neither did they so much as dream of any place of scripture that proved the same; for had they, surely they would never have spent so much time in sending into Greece for the true copies of the Nicene council, to see whether that had decreed any such thing or no. 3. It is observable also, that this assertion is so far from being grounded upon scripture, that it was never so much as determined by a general council, but the bishop of Rome is forced to forge a canon for it. 4. It is observable also, that the bishop of Rome is fallible; for he either knew that the canon which he pleaded was not any canon of the council of Nice, or he did not know it. If he did [q] not know it, he must needs be fallible, so shamefully erring in so plain a thing as that was, which scarce any one could be ignorant of: if he did know it was not the council of Nice, and said it was that council that decreed it, he lied not only to the council, but to his own conscience too, confidently avouching that to be established by the council of Nice which himself knew was not. 5. That in the judgment of these reverend and learned fathers, the council of Nice decreed, that all ecclesiastical controversies whatsoever should be ended in the province where they [r] arose, and no appeals to be made to foreign powers. Lastly, it is also here observable, that this council did unanimously determine, that no appeals should be made from foreign provinces to the bishop of Rome in particular; which certainly they would not, they could not have done, had they thought that he had any jurisdiction over the whole church, or over any churches out of his own provinces; all which being considered, we may well conclude, that the bishop of Rome hath not any power [s] or jurisdiction in the church of this realm in particular.

---

[q] Præfato itaque debitæ salutationis officio, impendio deprecamur, ut deinceps ad vestras aures hinc venientes non facilius admittatis, nec a nobis excommunicatos in communionem ultra velitis excipere: quia hoc etiam Nicæno concilio definitum facile advertat venerabilitas tua. Epist. concil. Afric. sive Carthag. ad Cælestinum, [p. 947. ibid.]

[r] Et decreta Nicæna sive inferioris gradus clericos, sive ipsos episcopos, suis metropolitanis apertissime commiserunt: prudentissime enim justissimeque viderunt, quæcunque negotia in suis locis, (ubi orta sunt,) finienda; nec unicuique provinciæ gratiam S. Spiritus defuturam. Ibid.

[s] Aut quomodo ipsum transmarinum judicium ratum erit, ad quod testium necessariæ personæ, vel propter sexus, vel propter senectutis infirmitatem, vel multis aliis intercurrentibus impedimentis, adduci non poterunt? Nam ut aliqui tanquam a tuæ sanctitatis latere mittantur, nulla invenimus patrum synodo constitutum. Ibid. From which last words the fourth and fifth canon of the council at Sardice decreeing appeals to Rome seem to be supposititious. For certainly, if that council had decreed any such thing, this that was not long after it (and therefore could not but be acquainted with their decrees) would not have said, Ut aliqui tanquam a tuæ sanctitatis latere mittantur, nulla invenimus patrum synodo constitutum. Especially considering that Athanasius, in his second apology to the emperor, reckons up no fewer than thirty-six African bishops that were present at the Sardicean council, every one of which, it is more than probable, carried the canons of the council home with them, and so what that council determined could not but be known to this. And this made Casanus Cardinalis himself ingenuously profess, Satis posse dubitari an Sardicensis concilii constitutio existat. De concord. cathol. l. 2. c. 25.

[q] *not* om. MS. [r] *arise* MS. [s] *in* MS.

Neither was the bishop of Rome's supremacy over the church of Christ in general only thus denied; but his authority in the realm of England in particular hath been long ago resisted. Indeed, William the Conqueror himself, whom they pretend to be so much devoted to the pope's service, when pope Hildebrand, otherwise called Gregory the Seventh, sent his legate Hubertus to gather up the Peter-pence, and to require an oath of allegiance and fidelity to the pope from him, the king, in his letter to him sends him express word, [t] "Your legate Hubertus, religious father, coming unto me, he admonished me of your part that I would swear fidelity to you and your successors, and consider better of the money which my predecessors used to send to the church of Rome; one of these things I have admitted, the other I have not admitted; I would not then, neither will I now swear to be faithful to you, because I neither promised any such thing, neither do I find that my predecessors did ever do so to your predecessors." From whence we may observe, how neither William the Conqueror nor his predecessors were absolutely subject to the pope, (for then he durst not have sent him such an answer,) and by consequence, that the pope even then had no absolute jurisdiction in this realm. And William the Conqueror being dead, and his second son, William Rufus, succeeding him in his kingdom, he did openly and expressly assert, that [u] "no archbishop nor bishop of his kingdom should be subject to the court of Rome or the pope," and the reason he gave of it was, [w] "because they do not follow the steps of Peter, gaping after rewards; they do not retain his power, whose holiness they are proved not to imitate." In this king's reign it was also that Anselme, archbishop of Canterbury, being denied leave by the king to go and fetch his pall from pope Urban, he presently appealed from the king to the pope, upon which the king told him, in plain terms, [x] "that if he would desist from his purpose, and promise upon the gospels that he would not visit the thresholds of the apostles, nor for any business appeal to the seat of Rome, then he might peaceably use and enjoy his own and his friends' goods, and be over the principal of the kingdom in every gift; but if he shall purpose otherwise, it would be free for him to go over the sea, but that he would do unwisely, for he should never after have hope of returning home again." Nay, and Anselme himself saith, in an epistle to Paschalis, then bishop of Rome, [y] "I asked leave of the king to go to the apostolical seat, to ask counsel about my soul and the office enjoined me. The king answered, that I sinned against him for the very asking of this leave; and he propounded to me, that I would either make satisfaction for this thing as for a fault, and assure him that I would never more ask such leave, nor ever after appeal to the see of Rome, or else that I would presently go out of his kingdom." And not only so, but in a council gathered together, an. 1095, Edinerus, who was one of the council, relates how [z] "all the bishops there present (he of Rochester expected) denied due subjection and obedience to him. And the king himself took away all his confidence of him, and swore he would not take him any longer for an archbishop or a father, unless he would deny that he would ever after give obedience to the vicar of St. Peter." From whence it appears, that almost six hundred years ago both the king and council determined that obedience ought not to be given by the subjects of this realm to the bishop of Rome, and by consequence, that the bishop of Rome even then had no jurisdiction in this realm.

---

[t] Hubertus legatus tuus, religiose pater, ad me veniens ex tua parte me admonuit, quatenus tibi et successoribus tuis fidelitatem facerem, et de pecunia, quam antecessores mei ad Romanam ecclesiam mittere solebant, melius cogitarem. Unum admisi, alterum non admisi. Fidelitatem facere nolui, nec volo; quia nec ego promisi, nec antecessores meos antecessoribus tuis id fecisse comperio. Ex Lanfranc. epist. apud Baron. an. 1079. [p. 555. vol. XI.]; et MS. in Biblioth. Cotton. exscript. a Jacob. Armach. [vid. Cat. Cott. MSS. p. 584.]

[u] Quod nullus archiepiscopus vel episcopus regni sui curiæ Romanæ vel papæ subesset. Mat. Paris. hist. ad an. 1094. [p. 19.]

[w] Quod Petri non hærent vestigiis præmiis inhiantes; non ejus potestatem retinent cujus sanctitatem probantur non imitari. Ibid.

---

[x] Quod si cœptis desisteret, si propositis evangeliis promitteret, se nec apostolorum limina visitaturum, nec pro quovis negotio Romanæ sedis audientiam appellaturum, tunc et suis et rebus suorum, cum omni tranquillitate posse uti et frui, et regni majoribus in omni donatione præesse. Sin secus ei visum est, trajicere quidem liberum esse, sed inconsulto id facturum, siquidem nullam revertendi spem imposterum ei futuram. Id. in major. Angl. hist. [p. 19.]

[y] Petii licentiam ab eo (rege), sedem adeundi apostolicam, ut inde consilium de anima mea, et de officio mihi injuncto acciperem. Respondit rex, me in se peccasse, pro sola postulatione hujus licentiæ; et proposuit mihi, ut aut de hac re, sicut de culpa, satisfacerem, et securum illum redderem, ne amplius peterem hanc licentiam, nec aliquando apostolicum appellarem, aut de terra ejus cito exirem. Anselm. epist. l. 3. epist. 40. ad Pasch. [p. 70.]

[z] Episcopi itaque omnes qui affuerunt, Roffensi solo excepto, aut uno aut alio modo debitam illi subjectionem et obedientiam abnegant. Rex etiam ipse cunctam ei confidentiam et securitatem sui in omnibus adimit, nec se illum pro archiepiscopo vel patre amplius habiturum jurat, nisi ipse vicario B. Petri se ulterius obediturum deneget. Edin. in vita Anselm. [p. 20.]

And as the bishop of Rome had little or no authority in this realm in the days of the two Williams, kings of England, so had he as little in the days of the two Henrys which succeeded them. What power he had in the days of king Henry the First (brother to William Rufus, third son to William the conqueror) appears from the pope's letter to the said king, wherein, amongst other things, he said, [a] "Seeing thou hast plentifully received from the hand of the Lord honour, riches, and peace, we much wonder and are grieved, that in thy kingdom and dominion St. Peter, (himself he meant,) and in St. Peter, the Lord hath lost his honour and right. For the messengers or letters of the apostolical seat obtain no reception or entrance into your dominion without the command of the royal majesty: there are no appeals from thence, no judgment is from thence appointed to the apostolical seat." So that it seems the pope had but small power here in the days of Henry the First; and truly he being dead, and Stephen also his immediate successor, the pope's power was as small in the days of king Henry the Second too; for in his reign were there several laws and constitutions made at Clarendon which the clergy and nobility were to subscribe to; and Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, was much troubled for opposing of them: as, that St. Peter's pence should no more be paid to the apostolical seat; that no decree or command proceeding from the authority of the pope or the bishop of Canterbury (then out of the kingdom) be received in this realm; and amongst other things it was decreed, as an ancient custom of this realm still to be observed, [b] "that no appeals be made to the apostolical see without leave from the king and his officials;" or, as it is more largely set down in the life of Thomas Becket, [c] "Concerning appeals, if they go from the archdeacon they ought to proceed to the bishop, from the bishop to the archbishop, and if the archbishop be wanting in the exercise of justice, it must be brought last of all to the lord the king, that by his precept in the archbishop's court the controversy may be ended. So that it ought not to proceed any further without the consent of our lord the king." By all which it evidently appears, that though the king might reverence the bishop of Rome, yet the bishop of Rome had no authority in his kingdom any further than the king himself would give him leave.

---

[a] Cum de manu Domini largius honorem divitias pacemque susceperis, miramur vehementius et gravamur quod in regno potestateque tua B. Petrus et in B. Petro Dominus honorem suum justitiamque perdiderit. Sedis enim apostolicæ nuncii vel literæ præter jussum regiæ majestatis nullam in potestate tua susceptionem aut aditum promerentur. Nullus inde clamor, nullum inde judicium ad sedem apostolicam destinatur. Paschal. pap. epist. ad Henric. reg. Angl.; MS. in biblioth. Cotton. exscript. a Jac. Armach. [vid. Cat. Cott. MSS. p. 188.]

I might trace the opposition that hath been made to the pope's supremacy in this realm of England almost in every king's reign since; but that would be a needless thing; what we have said already being enough upon which to affirm, approve, and pronounce, with the university of Cambridge, (that debated this question in their regent house, an. Dom. 1534.) that the bishop of Rome hath no more state, authority, or jurisdiction given him by God in the scriptures over this realm of England than any other externe bishop hath; and so, to conclude with what I began, *the bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction or authority in this realm of England.*

---

[b] Quod non appellaretur pro causa aliqua ad sedem apostolicam nisi regis et officialium suorum venia impetrata. Johan. Sarisb. epist. 159. [p. 254.]

[c] De appellationibus si emerserint ab archidiacono debent procedere ad episcopum, et ab episcopo ad archiepiscopum, et si archiepiscopus defuerit in justitia exhibenda ad dominum regem proveniendum est postremo; ut præcepto ipsius in curia archiepiscopi controversia terminetur; ita quod non debet ultra procedi absque assensu domini regis. Quadrilog. de vita Thom. Cantuariensis, [c. 8. Rescr. initio l. 5.]

The laws of the realm may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

I having transgressed my intended limits in speaking to the former parts of this article, I shall touch the more lightly upon these, especially considering that there is less opposition made against them, and therefore it is not so needful to expatiate upon the confirmation of them. First therefore of the first, that *the laws of the realm may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences*; for the proof of which truth I need go no further than the judicial laws of Moses, whereby several sorts of offenders were to be put to death for their several offences; as, murderers, Numb. xxxv. 30. Exod. xxi. 12; idolaters, Deut. xvii. 5; the smiter of his father or mother, Exod. xxi. 15; a manstealer, ver. 16; he that curses father or mother, ver. 17; witches, c. xxii. 18; he that lieth with a beast, ver. 19; and many such like offenders, were to be punished with death, and that by the command of God himself. Now though it be not necessary for these and the like judicial laws to be received into a Christian kingdom or commonwealth, yet it cannot but be lawful to receive them and act according to them. It is true these laws were made and enacted for the government of the Jewish nation only, and therefore not necessarily to be observed by others: but howsoever, seeing it was God himself that did establish them, whose will is a law, and whose pleasure is the ground of duty, it cannot possibly be that they should be unlawful in themselves, having once the stamp of divine authority upon them. Had not it been lawful to punish offenders with death, God would never have commanded it; or rather, seeing God was pleased to command it, it cannot but be therefore lawful; lawful I say, though not absolutely necessary; it is so lawful as that they may do it without sin, not so necessary as that they must do it or else sin. Seeing God enacted those laws, they are lawful to be received by all, though, seeing God enjoined them only to the Jews, they are necessarily to be observed only by them; though not necessarily to be observed now by them neither, they being no longer a peculiar nation, our Saviour by his cross having broken down the partition wall, and made of Jew and Gentile one sheepfold under himself, the chief Shepherd of our souls. And therefore Christ by his coming did not only abrogate the ceremonial but the judicial law too, so that after that time neither Jew nor Gentile [z] are obliged to the observation of them. But howsoever, though he did abrogate the necessity, he did not disannul the lawfulness of them, but it is still as lawful for all to observe those laws since his passion, as it was necessary for the Jews to observe them before his incarnation: and therefore such laws in particular as commanded offenders to be put to death may be observed now as well as then; or though those particular laws be not observed themselves, this general law deduced from them may, and ought certainly to be observed, even that heinous and grievous offenders be put to death.

Neither do I speak this as if it was never lawful before Moses to punish any offenders with death; for it was long before Moses commanded by God, *Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man*, Gen. ix. 6, and repeated by Christ, Matt. xxvi. 52; which plainly shews that it was not only lawful but necessary even before Moses's time to punish murderers with death. And as it was before his laws were established, it must needs be also after that his laws are repealed, even necessary as well as lawful to punish him with death that was the cause of another's death; especially considering that here is the reason of the law annexed, because *in the image of God made he man*, which reason always remaining, the law must need continue in force. And what is said of murder may also be applied to other the like offences, which whosoever are guilty of may justly be punished with death for them. Nay, such offences not only in justice may, but in justice ought to be so punished, for the magistrate *beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil*, Rom. xiii. 4; and therefore *a wise king scattereth the wicked, and bringeth the*

---

[z] MS. *was.*

wheel over them, Prov. xx. 26. And that it is lawful howsoever to punish heinous offenders with death St. Augustine intimates to us, saying, [a] "But he is no murderer who oweth his service to him that commandeth, as a sword is a help to him that useth it; and therefore they do not at all transgress against this command, whereby it is said, *Thou shalt do no murder*, who, God being the author, serve in war, or representing the person of the public power, do according to his laws, that is, according to the command of the most just reason, punish the wicked with death." So that it is not only lawful but most just to punish wicked offenders with death.

And as for the second thing, that it is lawful for Christian men at the command of the magistrate to serve in war, appears in that it was lawful for the Jews, then the only people of God, even under the Old Testament, so to do; yea, God himself commanded them to go out to war, Num. xxxi. 2, 3. Jos. viii. 21. 1 Sam. xxiii. 2. And what was lawful for them cannot be sinful for us, though there were many things sinful to them which are now lawful to us. And this also further appears in the answer which John the Baptist gave to the soldiers that came unto him, for *the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages*, Luke iii. 14. He doth not say, Throw aside your weapons, and serve no more in war, but rather adviseth them, or howsoever permits them to continue in the same employment, by shewing them how to behave themselves in it, even being content with their wages. And thus neither doth our Saviour command the centurion to resign his office, Luke vii, nor the apostles condemn Cornelius for being a centurion, Acts x; but to serve the magistrate in war was still looked upon as lawful as to serve him in any other employment, which in reason indeed we cannot but acknowledge, as considering the nature of a lawful war, (of which only we now speak,) which is nothing else but a just defence of the magistrate's person, kingdom, and prerogatives, which certainly are so lawful to be defended that it is sinful not to endeavour to defend them.

---

[a] Non autem ipse occidit, qui ministerium debet jubenti, sicut adminiculum gladius est utenti: et ideo nequaquam contra hoc præceptum fecerunt, quo dictum est, *Non occides*, qui Deo autore bella gesserunt, aut personam gerentes publicæ potestatis secundum ejus leges, hoc est, justissimæ rationis imperium, sceleratos morte punierunt. Aug. de civitate Dei, l. I. c. 21. [vol. VII.]

And thus did the Fathers of old teach. [b] "For the Fathers," saith St. Basil, "accounted slaughters in war to be no murders, as I think excusing such as strive for temperance and piety;" which they would not have done if they had thought it unlawful. And St. Augustine, speaking of those words of God to Joshua, *Lay thee an ambush for the city behind it,* saith, [c] "We are hence admonished that this is not unjustly done by such as wage a just war; that a just man should not take much thought about these things, but only that he undertake a just war, to whom it is lawful to war or to serve in war." The first council at Arles decreed, [d] "Concerning those that use their arms in peace, it pleaseth us that they be excommunicated;" implying that it is lawful to use them in war, not in peace. And the council at Magunce; [e] "We (ministers) who have left the world, this we will by all means observe, that having spiritual arms, we lay aside our secular: but the lay persons which are with us we do not hinder from wearing weapons; because it is an ancient custom, and hath been brought down even to us." And Sigebertus Gemblacensis tells us how in an ancient assembly of French bishops, [f] "one of them said he had letters brought him from heaven, which advised that peace be renewed upon earth: which thing he enjoined the others, and gave these things to be delivered to the people, that no one should bear arms, nor fetch back again what was taken from him, &c. But Gerardus Cameracensis could by no persuasions be brought to receive these things, but confuted every particular head; saying that mankind was from the beginning divided into three sorts, orators, fighters, and husbandmen, and the one of these wants the help of the two, and the two of the one, and therefore that weapons ought to be worn, and rapines be restored by the authority both of law and grace." And so we conclude *it is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.*

---

[b] *Τοὺς ἐν πολέμοις φόνους οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς φόνοις οὐκ ἐλογίσαντο, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, συγγνώμην δόντες τοῖς ὑπὲρ σωφροσύνης καὶ εὐσεβείας ἀμυνομένοις.* Basil. ad Amphil. epist. 1. [p. 26. vol. III.]

[c] Hinc admonemur non injuste fieri ab his, qui justum bellum gerunt; ut nihil homo justus præcipue cogitare debeat in his rebus, nisi ut justum bellum suscipiat, cui bellare fas est. Aug. in Jos. l. 6. quæst. 10. [vol. III.]

[d] De his qui arma projiciunt in pace, placuit abstinere eos a communione. Conc. Arel. 1. can. 3. [p. 263. vol. I. Conc. Hard.]

[e] Nos autem qui relinquimus seculum, id modis omnibus observare volumus, ut arma spiritualia habentes secularia dimittamus. Laicis vero, qui apud nos sunt, arma portare non præjudicemus; quia antiquus mos est, et ad nos usque pervenit. Conc. Magunt. c. 17. [p. 1013. vol. IV. ibid.]

[f] Unus eorum dixit, cœlitus sibi delatas esse literas quæ pacem monerent renovandam in terra; quam rem mandavit cæteris, et hæc tradenda dedit populis; Arma quisquam non ferret, direpta non repeteret, &c. Gerardus Cameracensis, (qui solus Lothariensium appendebat ad parochiam Francorum,) nullius hortatu potuit adduci ad hæc recipienda, sed singula capitula refellebat; dicens, genus hominum ab initio trifariam esse divisum, in oratoribus, pugnatoribus, agricultoribus, et unum duorum, et duos unius egere auxilio, ideo debere arma ferri, et rapinas reddi per auctoritatem legis et gratiæ. Sigebert. ad an. 1032. [p. 595.]

ARTICLE XXXVIII.

OF CHRISTIAN MEN'S GOODS, WHICH ARE NOT COMMON.

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

THOUGH communion of saints be a truth which ought to be believed by all, yet community of goods is an error which cannot be received by any, it striking at the foundation of Christian society, and subverting the whole scope of the holy scriptures; for if no man hath a propriety in any thing he enjoys, but his neighbour hath as good a title to it as himself, as the Fratricellians of old and the Anabaptists of late fancied, what signify the commands of God, *Thou shalt not steal*, Exod. xx. 15, and, *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house*, ver. 17? If I have as much right to my neighbour's goods as himself, how can I be said to steal any thing from him, when it is no more but to receive what is mine own of him? or why should I be forbidden to covet his house, when it is my own as well as his? And what then means that place of scripture also, *It is a more blessed thing to give than to receive?* Acts xx. 35. For if one man hath no more right to what he enjoys than another, how can one man be said to give to another, or the other to receive any thing as a gift from him? Certainly by this rule I cannot steal any thing from another, though I take all he hath from him; neither can he be said to give any thing to me, though he bestoweth all he hath upon me. For if I take any thing from him, I take no more than what is my own as well as his; and if he bestows any thing upon me, he gives me that which is no more his than mine own; and so according to this fancy (for an opinion I cannot call it) there could not be any stealing, neither need there be any giving. I could not steal though I would, and I need not give though I could. And further, admit this dream to be a truth, why should we be commanded to provide for our families, 1 Tim. v. 8? to give to him that asketh us, and to lend to him that would borrow of us, Matt. v. 42? Why should St. Paul's hands minister to his necessities, Acts xx. 34, and labour night and day that he might not be chargeable to any, 1 Thess. ii. 9? And many of the like places we find in scripture, which would signify nothing, if one man had no more title to or propriety in what himself enjoys than another.

It is true *the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common*, Acts iv. 32. This is the text which is commonly wrested to the destruction of the truth of this article: but certainly, if rightly understood, it will make more for it than against it; nay, not at all against it, but altogether for it. For here it is plainly said, *No man said of ought that he possessed;* so that it seems they had their several possessions at that time, which could not be if all things were so common amongst them as touching the right, title, and possession of the same. All things were indeed common amongst them as to the use of, but not as to the title to what they enjoyed. All things were so common as that none of them but willingly communicated what he had to others, but not so common as that others had a right and title to it as well as he; which also further appears in that it is said, *And as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things which were sold, and laid them at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made to every man according to his need*, Acts iv. 34, 35. From whence it appears that some were possessors of lands, others not; and it was they that possessed the lands that went and sold them; and when they had sold them they brought them to the apostles, and the apostles distributed to every one according as he had need; plainly implying that some had need and others not, and some had lands and others not, and they that had them it was in their power, not in the others' to sell them, and in their power, not in the others' to bring them to the apostles; yea, and it was in their power to bring them or not to bring them too. And therefore saith Peter to Ananias, *Whilst it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?* Acts v. 4. So that before he had sold it, it was his own, not another's, and after he had sold it, it was still in his own power, not another's; and so he alone had a title and right to it, until he had resigned it up to the apostles. Whence we may plainly see, that though there were not any amongst them that lacked, it was not because that they that had not estates had a title to theirs that had, [a] but because they that had estates were willing to communicate unto them that had not; so that there was a communication of estates to one another, and yet not a community in one another's estates.

And in this sense is Tertullian also to be understood when he saith, [b] "All things are common with us but only our wives; in that thing only we break community in which only other men exercise community;" not as if all things were then common as to the right, title, and possession of them, but all things were common as to the use and enjoyment of them. So that he that had no possessions enjoyed something of his that had; not because he had a title to it, but because he that had a title to it was pleased to communicate some part of it to him that had not; not some part of the title he had to his estate, but some part of the estate he had a title to. And in that he that had an estate gave to him that lacked, it is plain that he that lacked an estate had no right to his that had one. And that Tertullian is thus to be understood appears from what himself not long before saith in the same place; [c] "That which is a kind of chest is not gathered from the burdensome sum, as of a bought religion. Every one giveth a little every month, or when he will, and if he can, he adds to it; for no man is compelled, but every one giveth freely." Clearly implying, that there were some that had estates, and some that had not, and they that had, gave to them that had not. And that not always, but only once a month; nor then all his estate neither, but only as much as he would: nor yet was any one compelled to give any thing, but every one gave what himself pleased. And what were these things for? [d] "These are as it were the pledges of piety; for there is nothing given from thence to banquets, or collations, nor ingrateful devourings, but to nourish and bury the poor, to children, and orphans destitute of maintenance, and parents, and to ancient housekeepers:" all which things cannot possibly stand with the community of right and title to estates.

---

[a] *Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ χάρις, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἦν ἐνδεής· τουτέστιν, ἀπὸ τῆς πολλῆς προθυμίας τῶν ἐπιδιδόντων οὐδεὶς ἦν ἐνδεής· οὐ γὰρ μέρη μὲν ἐδίδοσαν, μέρη δὲ ἐταμιεύοντο· οὐδὲ πάντα μὲν ἐδίδοσαν, ὡς ἴδια δέ.* Chrysost. in Act. hom. 11. [p. 674, 5. vol. IV.]

[b] Omnia indiscreta sunt apud nos præter uxores. In isto loco consortium solvimus in quo solo cæteri homines consortium exercent. Tertull. apol. c. 39. [vol. V.]

[c] Etiamsi quod arcæ genus est, non de oneraria summa, quasi re-

And what Tertullian here avoucheth, Justin Martyr also confirms in his time too, saying, [e] "Those of us that have much and are willing, according to every one's pleasure, give and contribute as much as themselves will. And that which is gathered is given to the president, and he helps orphans and widows with it, and those that are in want by reason of sickness or any other cause, and those that are in bonds, and strangers that come a great way, and in brief he takes care of all that are in necessity." So that in his time also there were poor as well as rich; both such as gave, and such as received; such as abounded, and such as wanted; and by consequence no equality, or community in estates. Yea and before him too, Clemens Romanus exhorteth the Corinthians, [f] "Let him that is strong not despise him that is weak, and

---

demptæ religionis congregatur. Modicam unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel cum velit, et si modo possit, apponit; nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert. Ibid.

[d] Hæc quasi deposita pietatis sunt, nam inde non epulis nec potaculis nec ingratis voratrinis dispensatur, sed egenis alendis humandisque et pueris ac pupillis re ac parentibus destitutis, jamque domesticis senibus. Ibid.

[e] Οἱ εὐποροῦντες καὶ βουλόμενοι, κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ὃ βούλεται δίδωσι· καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ τῷ προεστῶτι ἀποτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπικουρεῖ ὀρφανοῖς τε καὶ χήραις, καὶ τοῖς διὰ νόσον, ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λειπομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις οὖσι ξένοις, καὶ ἁπλῶς πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν χρείᾳ οὖσι κηδεμὼν γίνεται. Justin. pro Christian. apol. [I. 67.]

[f] Ὁ ἰσχυρὸς μὴ ἀτημελείτω τὸν ἀσθενῆ, ὁ δὲ ἀσθενὴς ἐντρεπέτω τὸν ἰσχυρὸν, ὁ πλούσιος ἐπιχορηγείτω τῷ

let him that is weak reverence him that is strong; let the rich contribute to the poor, and the poor give thanks to God." And if there were some rich which should give to the poor, and some poor which should receive of the rich, the estates of the rich were not common to the poor, neither had the poor any title in the estates of the rich. To these we may also add that of Lactantius: [g] "Some may say," quoth he, "Are there not amongst you some poor, and some rich, some servants, and some masters? is not there some difference betwixt every one? No; neither is there any other reason why we call one another brethren, but because we believe ourselves to be equal; for seeing we measure all human things not by the body but by the spirit, though the condition of our bodies be diverse, yet they are not our servants, but we account and call them, by the spirit, brethren, and fellow servants in religion." So that he expressly tells us the outward or bodily condition of Christians in that age were diverse, though in piety and humility they were alike and equal; and therefore he presently adds, [h] "Seeing therefore the freemen are equal to the servants, and the rich to the poor in humility of mind, yet before God we are discerned by virtue." It was in the humility of their minds, not in the community of their goods, that they were equal to one another; and their communicating to one another's necessities argues they had no community in one another's estates; yea, and their having no community in one another's estates was the reason why they communicated to one another's necessities.

And certainly though there be no communion in, yet there ought to be a communication of our estates one to another;

πτωχῷ, ὁ δὲ πτωχὸς εὐχαριστείτω τῷ Θεῷ. Clem. epist. ad Corinth. pp. 49, 50.

[g] Dicet aliquis: nonne sunt apud vos alii pauperes, alii divites? alii servi, alii domini? nonne aliquid inter singulos interest? nihil; nec alia causa est, cur nobis invicem fratrum nomen impertiamus, nisi quia pares esse nos credimus. Nam cum omnia humana non corpore, sed spiritu metiamur, tametsi corporum sit diversa conditio, nobis tamen servi non sunt; sed eos et habemus, et dicimus spiritu fratres, religione conservos. Lactant. de justit. c. [16. vol. I.]

[h] Cum itaque et liberi servis, et divites pauperibus humilitate animi pares simus, apud Deum tamen virtute discernimur. Ibid.

and therefore it is added in the article, *Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.* According to the apostle's command, *Charge them that are rich in this world, that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate,* 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18. And [i] many such commands are there in scripture, with promises and threatening annexed to them, whereby all are enjoined to communicate of what they have unto such as lack it. Although the poor hath no title to the estates of the rich, yet the rich are bound to relieve the necessities of the poor; and therefore saith St. Basil, [k] "Art thou poor? yet thou hast another poorer than thyself; thou hast bread enough for ten days, he but for one; what abounds to thee, like a good man do thou keep for the poor, not thinking much to give something of a little. Do not thou prefer thine own profit before the common danger." [l] "Thou sayest thou art rich and wealthy," saith St. Cyprian, "and thinkest thou must use those things which God would have thee to possess; use them but to saving things, use them but to good acts, use them to those things which God hath commanded, which the Lord hath discovered; let the poor perceive thee to be rich, let the needy perceive thee to be wealthy." But it would be an endless thing to heap up the several passages we meet with in the fathers to this purpose; I shall add only that excellent notion of St. Chrysostome: [m] "Why therefore dost thou deprive thyself of those things whereof God would have thee to be the master? For for this cause he commanded thee to give of thy riches to another, that thou thyself mightest have them; for so long as thou keepest them thyself, not so much as thyself hast them, but when thou givest them to another, then thyself receivest them." And therefore I conclude, that though Christian men's goods be not common, yet they ought to be communicated to one another.

---

[i] Nunquam denique, fratres charissimi, admonitio divina cessavit, nunquam tacuit, quo minus in scripturis sanctis tam veteribus quam novis, semper et ubique ad misericordiæ opera Dei populus provocaretur; et canente atque exhortante Spiritu S., quisquis ad spem regni cælestis instruitur, facere eleemosynas juberetur. Cyprian. serm. I. de eleemosyna, [p. 198.]

[k] *Πένης εἶ; ἀλλ' ἄλλον ἔχεις πάντως πενέστερον· σοὶ δέκα ἡμερῶν τὰ σιτία, ἐκείνῳ μιᾶς· ὡς καλῶς εὐγνώμων, τὸ σὸν περιττὸν ἐπανάσωσον πρὸς τὸν ἐνδεῆ, μὴ ὀκνήσας ἐκ τοῦ ὀλίγου δοῦναι· μὴ προτιμήσῃς τὸ σὸν συμφέρον ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ κινδύνου.* Basil. de eleemosyna, conc. 4. [p. 467. vol. III.]

[l] Locupletem te esse dicis et divitem, et utendum te putas esse iis, quæ possidere te Deus voluit: utere, sed ad res salutares, utere, sed ad bonas artes, utere, ad illa quæ Deus præcepit, quæ Dominus ostendit. Divitem te sentiant pauperes, locupletem sentiant indigentes. Cyprian. de hab. virgin. tract. II. [p. 97.]

[m] *Τί τοίνυν ἀποστερεῖς σεαυτὸν ὧν αὐτός σε βούλεται κύριον εἶναι; διὰ*

τοῦτο γὰρ σοὶ ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὰ δοῦναι ἑτέρῳ, ἵνα σὺ αὐτὰ ἔχῃς· ἕως μὲν γὰρ μόνος κατέχεις, οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἔχεις. ὅταν δὲ ἑτέρῳ δῷς, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλαβες. Chrysost. in Rom. hom. 7. [p. 51, 25. vol. III.]

ARTICLE XXXIX.

OF A CHRISTIAN MAN'S OATH.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James his apostle, so we judge, that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

[a] AN oath being nothing else but the calling upon God to witness the truth of what we say, a rash or a vain oath must needs be nothing else than the taking the name of God rashly and in vain; and therefore our Saviour, who came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law, commands us not to transgress, but to obey the law, saying, *Swear not at all*, Matt. v. 34; and the apostle James, writing after his Master's copy, *Swear not, neither by heaven, neither by earth, neither by any other oath*, James v. 12. In which places though to swear lawfully is permitted, yet to swear rashly is altogether prohibited. A sin which there being neither pleasure nor profit in, one should think man might easily be persuaded from; but so corrupt is the heart of man, that I am confident the only reason so many indulge themselves in it, is only because it is a sin. Had God commanded it, we should have been natu-

---

[a] Πόθεν οὖν ἐπεισῆλθεν ὁ ὅρκος; ὅτε τὰ κακὰ ηὐξήθη, ὅτε πάντα ὁμοῦ ἄνω καὶ κάτω γέγονεν, ὅτε πρὸς εἰδωλολατρείαν ἀπέκλιναν· τότε δὴ, τότε, ὅτε ἄπιστοι λοιπὸν ἐφαίνοντο, τὸν Θεὸν ἐκάλουν μάρτυρον, ὥσπερ ἐγγυητὴν διδόντες τῶν λεγομένων ἀξιόχρεων· τοῦτο γὰρ ὅρκος ἐστὶ, τρόπων ἀπιστουμένων ἐγγυή. Chrysost. in Act. apost. hom. 9. [p. 662, 13. vol. IV.]

rally averse from it, but seeing God hath forbidden it, we are naturally inclined to it; so that had it been no sin, the heart of man would not have been so set upon it, especially considering he can reap neither pleasure, profit, nor honour from it. But seeing it is a sin so frequently forbidden by God, and a sin so highly odious to him, therefore is the heart of man (which, being fallen from God to sin, naturally delights itself more in sin than God, therefore I say is it) so much taken with it, therefore doth it please itself so much in it; so that though there be no other pleasure in this sin, they will therefore take pleasure in it because it is a sin. But I wish the foulmouthed ruffians of the world, who never think they speak rhetorically enough unless they back each word or emphasis each sentence with an oath, I wish, I say, they would at length bethink themselves how they offend their Maker by it. But I know that is no motive to drive them from it, but rather an encouragement to draw them to it; for was not God so displeased at it, they would never be so pleased with it. I wish, therefore, they would consider how they do not only offend God, but condemn themselves by every vain oath they pollute their mouths withal; they condemn themselves, I say, for men of no credit, nor ever to be believed unless they vainly bring God to witness what they say. And if they will not receive this at mine, let them receive it at St. Basil's mouth, [b] "For it is altogether a foul and a foolish thing," saith that reverend father, "for a man to accuse himself as one unworthy to be believed, and therefore to confirm what he saith by oaths." [c] "For an oath," saith St. Chrysostome, "is a bringing of a surety for those things which otherwise would not be believed." So that he that swears is first accused as one not to be believed without a surety, yea, so great a surety. For it is for their great unbelief of him that they do not seek a man but God himself to be his surety. And hence it is, that whensoever I hear a man swear, I presently think that man is conscious to himself that he hath so often falsified his word, that now he is not to be believed without an oath; and if he is not to be believed unless he swears, he is not to be believed though he swears. For he that makes no conscience of his word, will make as little of his oath; and he that doth not stick to swear rashly, will not stick to swear falsely. And therefore the more a man sweareth what he saith is true, the more am I apt to think what he saith is false. But as there is a sinful, so there is also a lawful use of an oath. So that though many a man sins when he swears, yet a man may swear and not sin, especially if a man be commanded by the lawful magistrate to swear in a lawful thing; then a man is so far from sinning if he swears, that he sins unless he swears; and that because an oath is in itself lawful, so that a man may do it without sin, and therefore must do it when commanded or else sin. And that it is thus lawful in itself to swear, we may see in the frequent command and examples of it we meet with in the scripture: as, *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and swear by his name*, Deut. vi. 13. x. 20: *Then shall an oath of the Lord be between them both, that he hath not put his hand to his neighbour's goods*, Exod. xxii. 11: *Who shall abide in thy tabernacle, or who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not*, Ps. xv. 1, 4: *Every one that sweareth by him shall glory*, Ps. lxiii. 11. And many of the eminent saints of God are recorded in scripture to have sworn. Abraham sware to Abimelech, Gen. xxi. 24, 31; [d] *Jacob sware by the fear of his father Isaac*, Gen. xxxi. 53;

---

[b] *Αἰσχρὸν γὰρ παντελῶς καὶ ἀνόητον ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορεῖν ὡς ἀναξίου πίστεως, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν ὅρκων ἀσφάλειαν ἐπιφέρεσθαι.* Basil. in Ps. 14. [p. 133. vol. I.]

[c] *Τοῦτο γὰρ ὅρκος ἐστὶ, τρόπων ἀπιστουμένων ἐγγύη. ὥστε πρώτη κατηγορία αὕτη τοῦ ὀμνύοντος, εἰ μὴ πιστεύοιτο χωρὶς ἐγγύου, καὶ ἐγγύου μεγάλου. Διὰ γὰρ τὴν πολλὴν ἀπιστίαν οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ζητοῦσιν ἔγγυον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεόν.* Chrysost. in Act. hom. 9. vol. IV. p. 662, [16.]

---

[d] Jacob swore by the fear of his father Isaac, that is, by God, whom his father Isaac feared. So Onkelos in his Targum plainly וקים יעקוב בדדחיל ליה אבוהי יצחק *And Jacob swore by him whom his father Isaac feared:* and Jonathan more fully, וקים יעקיב באלהא דדחיל ליה אבוי יצחק *And Jacob swore by the God whom his father Isaac feared.* And God may well be called our fear, because he is the only person in the world we need or ought to fear, Matt. x. 28. And hence it is that דחלא is used for אלהא as וכפרו בדחלא תקיפא *Et negarunt Deum fortem*, Deut. xxxii. 15. Targ. Hier. And where it is in Hebrew אלהי כסף ואלהי זהב *Gods of silver and gods of gold*, and in the Syriac ܐܠܗܐ ܕܕܗܒܐ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܕܣܐܡܐ *Gods of gold and gods of silver*, Exod. xx. 23, the Chaldee paraphrase hath it דחלן דכסף ודחלן דדהב. And so דחלא is mostly used for false gods. V. Hos. viii. 6.

Moses sware on that day, Jos. xiv. 9; *And Saul sware, As the Lord liveth, he shall not be slain*, 1 Sam. xix. 6; *And David sware unto Saul*, ch. xxiv. 22; *Then king Solomon sware by the Lord*, 1 Kings ii. 23. And as they sware themselves, so they required others to swear too. *And I will make thee swear by the Lord*, saith Abraham to his servant, Gen. xxiv. 3; *And Jacob said unto Joseph, Swear unto me; and he sware unto him*, Gen. xlvii. 31. Yea God himself is often in scripture said to swear: *By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord*, Gen. xxii. 16; *For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself*, Heb. vi. 13; *Behold, I have sworn by my great name, saith the Lord*, Jer. xliv. 26; *The Lord hath sworn by his holiness*, Amos iv. 2; and, *The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it*, Ps. cxxxii. 11. And certainly what God himself doth cannot be unlawful in itself to be done. And hence it is also that there are rules set down to be observed in our swearing, *And thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in truth, in righteousness, and in judgment*, Jer. iv. 2: in truth, so as not to swear falsely; in righteousness, so as not to swear unjustly; and in judgment or discretion, so as not to swear ignorantly. But if it were a sin in itself to swear, it would be in vain to prescribe rules to be observed in swearing; nay, seeing there are rules thus prescribed to be observed in swearing, it thence follows that it is no sin in itself to swear.

Against this cloud of witnesses which this truth is thus encompassed about withal, its adversaries have nothing to plead, but that our Saviour and the apostle James, as we saw even now, said expressly, *Swear not at all;* from whence they conclude, that though it was lawful under the law, it is now sinful under the new testament, not considering what our Saviour expressly avoucheth in the beginning of the said sermon, *Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil*, Matt. v. 17; though he came to destroy the judicial and ceremonial, yet he came not to destroy the moral law. Now it is plain that this law about oaths doth not belong to the ceremonial or judicial law, which he came to destroy, but only to the moral law, which he came to fulfil; and therefore whatsoever interpretation we put upon these words, *Swear not at all*, we must be sure not to make our Saviour to contradict himself, and say he came to destroy the moral law, when himself expressly saith he came to fulfil it. And therefore, when he saith, *Swear not at all*, we must not so understand it as if he forbad all manner of swearing, but swearing after that manner which the Jews had brought up among themselves, even to swear by the creature as well as by the Creator, by the heavens, where God dwells, as well as by that God that dwells in the heavens, and the like; and [e] never to think themselves obliged to perform what they had so sworn to do. And it was these false glosses upon the law which our Saviour strikes at in these words, as we may see plainly by what follows; *Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: nor by the earth; for it is his footstool*, Matt. v. 34, 35: so that it was swearing by heaven, and swearing by earth, and swearing by other creatures, which Christ here commands us to abstain from. Or, howsoever, it is manifest that it is common swearing he here aims at, as appears from what follows; *But let your communication*, or common discourse, *be, Yea, yea; and Nay, nay*, v. 37: [f] so that it was in our common discourse that he here commands us not to *swear at all;* not at all forbidding us to swear upon necessary and urgent occasions.

But that our Saviour doth not forbid all manner of swearing when he commands us not to *swear at all*, is plain also from the practice and example of the apostle St. Paul. For that St. Paul understood the meaning of our Saviour in these words better than any one doth or can in these days, I hope there is none as yet so sottishly ignorant and so highly presumptuous as to deny. [g] Yet we find him often swearing, and calling upon God to witness what he saith: *For God is my record*, saith he, *how greatly I long after you all*, Phil. i. 8: *I say the truth in God, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost*, Rom. ix. 1: *The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not*, 2 Cor. xi. 31: *We speak before God in Christ*, ch. xii. 19: *The things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not*, Gal. i. 20: *As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting*, 2 Cor. xi. 10. Nay, it is observable, though himself takes notice of that expression, *Yea, yea, and y, nay*, which our Saviour commanded us always to use, Cor. i. 17, yet in the very next words he saith, *But as God is true*, ver. 18; and presently, *Moreover I call God for a record upon my soul, that to spare you I came not as yet to Corinth*, ver. 21: so that it is impossible any one should swear more plainly than he did; yet who dare say he durst have sworn if our Saviour had expressly forbidden all manner of swearing. To which we may also add, that not only St. Paul, but the angel, *sware by him that liveth for ever and ever*, Rev. x. 6; and St. Paul himself also saith, *For men verily swear by the greater; and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife*, Heb. vi. 16. *For men*, not men of this world only, not Jews only, not Gentiles only, but men in general, *swear*

---

[e] Quæri autem potest, cum diceretur, *Ego autem dico vobis, Non jurare omnino*, cur additum sit, *neque per cælum, quia thronus Dei est;* et cætera usque ad id quod dictum est, *neque per caput tuum?* Credo propterea, quia non putabant Judæi se teneri jurejurando, si per ista jurassent; et cum audierant, *Reddes autem Domino jusjurandum tuum;* non se putabant Domino debere jusjurandum, si per cælum aut terram, aut per Hierosolymam, aut per caput suum jurarent; quod non vitio præcipientis, sed illis male intelligentibus, factum est. Itaque Dominus docet nihil esse tam vile in creaturis Dei, ut per hoc quisquam perjurandum arbitretur. Aug. de serm. in monte, l. 1. [52. par. ii. vol. III.]

[f] Ita ergo intelligitur præcepisse Dominum ne juretur, ne quisquam sicut bonum appetat jusjurandum, et assiduitate jurandi ad perjurium per consuetudinem delabatur. Aug. Ibid. [51.] Lex pœnam posuerat perjurio, ut fraudulentiam mentium sacramenti religio contineret, simulque plebs rudis atque insolens frequentem de Deo suo mentionem haberet familiaritate jurandi. Fides vero sacramenti consuetudinem removet, simplicitatem loquendi audiendique præscribens. Hilar. in loc. [p. 627.]

---

[g] Sed tamen quoniam jurat qui adhibet testem Deum, considerandum est hoc capitulum, ne contra præceptum Domini apostolus dixisse videatur, qui sæpe hoc modo juravit, cum dicit, *Quæ autem scribo vobis, ecce coram Deo, quod non mentior;* et iterum, *Deus et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui est benedictus in sæcula, scit quod non mentior;* tale est illud, *Testis enim mihi est Deus, cui servio in spiritu meo in evangelio Filii ejus, quoniam sine intermissione memoriam vestri facio semper in orationibus meis.* Nisi forte quis dicat tunc cavendam esse jurationem, cum per aliquod dicitur quod juratur; ut non juraverit, qui non dixerit, per Deum; sed dixit, *Testis est mihi Deus;* ridiculum est hoc putare, tamen propter contentiosos aut multum tardiores, ne aliquid interesse quis putet, sciat etiam hoc modo jurasse apostolum dicentem, *Quotidie morior, per vestram gloriam*, 1 Cor. xv. Aug. de serm. Dei in monte, l. 1. [51. par. ii. vol. III.]

by the greater; for one sort of men is not here opposed to another, but men in general to God; neither doth he reprove them for it, but commends it, as that which is the *end of all strife.* So full, so clear is scripture, both in precepts and precedents, to assure us that it is as lawful to swear in itself, as it is sinful to swear in vain.

Neither doth scripture only, but reason also, proclaim this doctrine for a truth. For, first, that which is part of God's honour must needs be lawful; but now to swear lawfully is part of his honour, and therefore is serving God and swearing by his name joined together, Deut. vi. 13; indeed, from swearing by his name lawfully, according to his will, there is much honour redounding to him, for hereby we acknowledge him to be an all-seeing God, who seeth what I think, as well as men hear what I speak. Hereby we acknowledge him to be a God that loveth justice and truth, and will severely revenge all such as take his name in vain; so that to deny this truth is to rob God of a great part of his honour. Secondly, if we consider the nature of a lawful oath, we shall easily see that it is lawful to take an oath; for a lawful oath is nothing but a calling upon God to witness what is true. Now to call upon God is no sin; and to call upon God to do good, even to defend the truth, by bearing witness to it, cannot possibly be accounted any sin, there being no law transgressed by it. Lastly, to this we may also add, that an oath is the end of strife; and so the end of an oath is to be the end of strife, and to establish peace and equity betwixt man and man: and so the end of it cannot possibly but be acknowledged as lawful in its nature; and seeing the nature and end of it is lawful, itself cannot be sinful, but a man may swear when the magistrate requireth him, and not sin; nay, but rather sin if he doth not swear, in not obeying the magistrate in such things which he may lawfully do.

And if we consult the Fathers we shall find them indeed much inveighing against rash and vain swearing: as St. Chrysostome; [h] "Let us now," saith he, "set ourselves daily laws;

---

[h] Θῶμεν τοίνυν ἑαυτοῖς νόμους καθημερινούς· τέως ἀπὸ τῶν εὐκόλων ἀρξώμεθα· περικόψωμεν ἡμῶν τὴν πολυορκίαν τοῦ στόματος, χαλινὸν ἐπιθῶμεν τῇ γλώττῃ, μηδεὶς ὀμνύτω τὸν Θεόν· οὐκ ἔστιν ἐνταῦθα δαπάνη,

and in the mean while let us begin from those things that are the easiest. Let us cut off the evil custom of swearing from our mouths; let us put a bridle to our tongue; let no one swear by God: here is no charges, here is no labour, here is no care of time required; it sufficeth that he be but willing, and all is done; it is merely a business of custom: I beseech you and entreat you therefore let us set upon this study." And presently; [i] "With a loud and a clear voice I speak to all, and witness, that those that are guilty of this sin, those that speak things that are of evil, (for so is such swearing,) that they come not over the church threshold." And again; [k] "Fast, and pray to God, and we with you, that he would take from amongst us this pernicious custom." And St. Augustin, prescribing rules for an upright conversation, puts this amongst the rest; [l] "Altogether shun the custom of swearing, for in this you go much contrary to the commands of God." And many such like expressions we meet with in the Fathers, especially in Tertullian, Basil, Chrysostome, and Athanasius.

But howsoever, though they did so much condemn vain and rash swearing, yet they accounted swearing as a thing in itself lawful. For the sixth general council, commonly called the Trullan council, decreed, [m] "Those that swear the oaths of the gentiles the canon punisheth, and we decree them to be excommunicated." They punished such as took the sinful oaths of the gentiles by their false gods, not such as swear the lawful oaths of the Christians by the true God; and seeing they punished them and not these, it follows that

---

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐνταῦθα κάματος, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐνταῦθα χρόνου μελέτη· ἀρκεῖ θελῆσαι, καὶ τὸ πᾶν γέγονε· συνηθείας γὰρ τὸ πρᾶγμά ἐστι· παρακαλῶ καὶ δέομαι, σπουδὴν τοιαύτην εἰσενέγκωμεν. Chrysost. in Act. apost. hom. 8. [p. 654, 30. vol. IV.]

[i] *Διὸ μεγάλῃ καὶ λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ κηρύττω πᾶσι καὶ διαμαρτύρομαι, ὅτι τοὺς τὴν παράβασιν ταύτην ἐπιδεικνυμένους, τοὺς τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ φθεγγομένους (τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ὅρκος) τῶν οὐδῶν μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν.* Ibid. [p. 655, 8.]

[k] *Νηστεύετε, παρακαλέσατε τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ ἡμεῖς μεθ' ὑμῶν, ὥστε τὴν ὀλέθριον ταύτην ἐξελεῖν συνήθειαν.* Ibid. [28.]

[l] Jurandi consuetudinem funditus evitate; quia valde præceptis in hac parte contraitis. Aug. de. rectitud. cathol. convers. [18. p. 273. App. vol. VI.]

[m] *Τοὺς ὀμνύοντας ὅρκους Ἑλληνικοὺς ὁ κανὼν ἐπιτιμίοις καθυποβάλλει· καὶ ἡμεῖς τούτοις τὸν ἀφορισμὸν ὁρίζομεν.* Concil. Trul. can. 94. [p. 1693. vol. III. conc. Hard.]

they acknowledged these to be lawful, but condemned them only to be sinful. And St. Gregory saith, [n] "Let therefore every one be wary before he swears, that he may either not swear at all, or that he do not swear to do any evil things." So that a man may swear, but he must have a care how he swears; he may swear, but to do good, not evil. And Cyril of Alexandria; [o] "Let yea and nay, amongst those that have chosen to live the best life, have the use and force of an oath, and let things be so confirmed; for it will follow that we ought so also to be believed: but if yea and nay be despised by any, let the use of oaths be at last turned or directed to that which is greater than us, yea, and every creature, viz. the Deity; so that when bare asseverations will not do, confirmation by oaths may be allowed of." St. Augustin hath many things to this purpose: [p] "It is much safer," saith he, "as I said, that as much as we can we never swear; that our communication be *Yea, yea, Nay, nay*, as our Saviour admonisheth: not because it is a sin to swear what is true, but because it is a most grievous sin to swear what is false:" so that to swear in itself is no sin, for a man may swear, and not sin. And again; [q] "Wherefore he that understandeth that swearing is to be reckoned not amongst the good but the necessary things, refraineth as much as he can, so as not to use it but upon necessity, when he seeth men slow to believe what is profitable for them to believe, unless they be confirmed by swearing." And presently; [r] "But thou dost not do evil that usest swearing well; for though it be not good, yet it is necessary that thou shouldest persuade another that which thou profitably persuadest him." And therefore Photius tells us, that, according to their law, [s] in doubtful matters, the judge used to take their oath, and make them swear, and so to pass sentence in the case; and that the magistrate may lawfully require an oath, and by consequence others lawfully take it. I shall only add that of St. Augustin; [t] "Though it be said we should not swear, yet I do not remember it is any where read that we should not receive or take an oath from another;" and therefore I conclude, that though a man ought not to swear rashly and vainly, yet if it be required of the magistrate, he may lawfully swear.

---

[n] Sit ergo unusquisque cautus, antequam juret, ut aut ne omnino juret, aut facturum se mala non juret. Greg. mag. in 1 Reg. c. 14. expos. l. 5. [c. iv. 57. p. 328. par. ii. vol. III.]

[o] *Ἔστω τοιγαροῦν τὸ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὖ, παρά γε τοῖς ἄριστα βιοῦν ᾑρημένοις, ὅρκου χρεία τε καὶ δύναμις, καὶ διαπεπήχθω ὀρθῶς· ἕψεται γὰρ οὕτω καὶ τὸ πιστεύεσθαι δεῖν· εἰ δὲ ἀτιμάζοιτο πρὸς τινὸς τὸ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὖ, τῶν ὅρκων ἡ χρεία τετράφθω λοιπὸν ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς, μᾶλλον ἢ κατὰ πᾶσαν κτίσιν.* Cyril. Alex. de adorat. in spirit. et verit. l. 6. [p. 214. vol. I.]

[p] Multo enim tutius, ut dixi, quantum ad nos attinet, nunquam juremus, ut sit in ore nostro, *est est, non non*, sicut Dominus monet; non quia peccatum est, verum jurare; sed quia gravissimum peccatum est falsum jurare; quo citius cadit, qui consuevit jurare. Aug. epist. ad Hilar. [157. vol. II.]

[q] Quapropter qui intelligit, non in bonis, sed in necessariis jurationem habendam, refrenat se quantum potest, ut non ea utatur, nisi necessitate, cum videt pigros esse homines ad credendum quod eis utile est credere, nisi juratione firmentur. Id. de sermone Dom. in monte, l. 1. [51. p. 187. par. ii. vol. III.]

---

[r] Tu autem non malum facis, qui bene uteris juratione, quia etsi non bona, tamen necessaria est, ut alteri persuadeas quod utiliter persuades. Ibid.

[s] Ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἀμφιβόλοις εἴωθεν ὁ δικαστὴς ἐπιφέρειν ὅρκον, καὶ οὕτω ψηφίζεσθαι. Apud Balsam. in can. p. 212.

[t] Quamvis dictum sit ne juremus; nusquam autem in scripturis sanctis legi meminerim, ne ab alio jurationem accipiamus. Aug. epist. ad Publicolam, [47. 2. p. 110. vol. II.] v. Jus Græc. Roman.

בא״יאמ״ה

A Catalogue of Fathers, Councils, and other ancient Authors, cited in this book, according to the order of time wherein they are supposed to have flourished.

	A.D.
Jacobus, Justus, auctor supposititii πρωτευαγγελίου	34
Nicodemus, auctor supposititii evangelii de pass. et resur. Christi	34
Hermas, discipulus Pauli	38
Lucius Æneas Seneca, philos. Cordubensis	50
Clemens, episcopus Romanus	60
Dionysius Areopagita, Atheniensis	70
Linus, episcopus Romanus	70
Philo, Judæus, natione Alexandrinus, qui etiam a S. Hieronymo inter scriptores ecclesiasticos ponitur	70
Josephus, Judæus Hierosolymitanus, qui et de Christo testimonium dedit	100
Ignatius, episc. Antiochenus	110
Polycarpus, episc. Smyrnensis	150
Justinus, martyr	150
Athenagoras, Atheniensis, philosophus Christianus	150
Melito, episcopus Sardensis	150
Smyrnensis ecclesia de martyrio Polycarpi	169
Theophilus, episc. Antiochenus	170
Tatianus, Justini auditor	170
Egesippus, historicus, natione Judæus	177
Irenæus, episc. Lugdunensis	180
Maximus	190
Concil. Romanum de paschate	198
Concilium Osroenum de eodem	198
Concil. Palæstinum de eodem	198
Concilium Ponticum de eodem	198
Concilium Asiaticum de eodem	198
Concilium Gallicum de eodem	198
Clemens, presb. Alexandrinus	200
Tertullianus, presbyter	200
Hippolytus, episc. et martyr	220
Origenes, Adamantius	230
Minutius Felix, Causidicus	230

	A.D.
Ammonius, Alexandrinus	230
Gregorius, episcopus Neocæsariensis, ob multa miracula Thaumaturgus dictus	240
Novatianus, presb. Romanus	240
Cyprianus, episcopus Carthaginiensis	250
Concil. Romanum i. de causa lapsorum	253
Concil. Carthag. de ead. causa	254
Concil. Roman. ii. de ead. causa	254
Concil. Italic. de ead. causa	255
Concil. Carthag. in causa Felicissimi et Novatiani	255
Concil. African. i. pro reformatione disciplinæ ecclesiasticæ	257
Methodius, Tyri episcopus	257
Arnobius, presbyter	300
Lactantius Firmianus	300
Concilium Eliberitanum	305
Concilium Arelatense i.	314
Concilium Ancyranum	314
Concilium Neocæsariense	314
Concilium Laodicenum	320
Concilium Gangrense	324
Constantinus, magnus, Imp.	325
Concil. Nicænum i. generale, episcoporum 318	325
Antonius, monachus, cujus vitam Athanasius descripsit	325
Eusebius, Cæsariensis	325
Athanasius, episcopus Alex.	325
Macarius, Hierosolymit.	325
Concilium Arelatense ii.	330
Concilium Alexandrinum	339
Concilium Antiochenum	340
Concilium Sardicense	347
Concilium Carthaginiense	349
Acacius, Cæsariensis	350
Hilarius, Pictaviensis	359
Ephrem, Syrus	365
Damasus, episc. Romanus	370
Macarius, Ægyptius	370
Cyrillus, Hierosolymitanus	370

	A.D.
Optatus, episc. Milevitanus	370
Basilius, episc. Cæsariensis	370
Ambrosius, Mediolanensis	370
Gregorius, Nazianzenus	380
Gregorius, Nyssenus	380
Pacianus, episc. Barcinonens.	380
Nectarius, episc. Constantinop.	380
Philastrius, episc. Brixianus	380
Amphilochius, episc. Iconii	380
Prudentius, presbyter	380
Concil. Constantinopol. i. universale ii. episcopor. 150	381
Concil. Cæsaraugustanum	381
Gaudentius, episc. Brixianus	390
Hieronymus, presbyter	390
Theophilus, Alexandrinus	390
Cælius Sedulius, presbyter	390
Epiphanius, Salaminæ Cypri episcopus	390
Ruffinus, presb. Aquileiensis	390
Concilium Hipponense	393
Concilium Carthaginiense ii.	397
Concilium Carthaginiense iii.	398
Concilium Carthaginiense iv.	399
Johannes, Chrysostomus, episc. Constantinopol.	400
Basilius, Seleuciensis	400
Marcus, eremita	400
Hesychius, presbyter	400
Concilium Toletanum i.	400
Pelagius, Brito hæreticus	410
Augustinus, episc. Hipponens.	410
Concilium Diospolitanum in Palæstina	415
Concil. Carthaginiense contra Pelagium et Cælestinum	416
Concil. Milevitanum ii. contra eosdem	416
Concilium Carthagin. v.	418
Concilium Carthagin. vi.	419
Paulinus, Nolanus	420
Maximus, Taurinens.	420
Siricius, episc. Romanus	420
Hilarius, Arelatensis	424
Concilium Carthag. ult.	425
Vincentius, presb. Lirinensis	430
Johannes Cassianus	430
Cyrillus, Alexandrinus	430
Proclus, Cyzicenus	430
Theodoretus, episc. Cyri, vel Cyrenensis	430
Concil. Ephesinum, univers. iii. episcoporum 200	431
Concil. Rhegiense vel Rigense	439
Prosper Aquitanicus, episc. Regiensis	440
Isidorus, Pelusiota, monachus	440
Eucherius, Lugdunensis	440

	A.D.
Socrates, historiographus	440
Sozomenus, historiographus	440
Petrus, Chrysologus	440
Concilium Arausicanum i.	441
Nilus, monach. Constantinop.	445
Leo, papa i.	450
Primasius, episc. Afric.	450
Vincentius, presbyter Gallus	450
Concil. Chalcedonense, univers. iv. episcoporum 630	451
Concilium Andegavense	453
Salonius, episc. Viennensis	470
Salvianus, presb. Massiliens.	470
Gelasius, Cyzicenus	476
Eugenius, episc. Carthagin.	480
Sidonius, episc. Avernorum	480
Gennadius, presb. Masiliensis	490
Faustinus	490
Felix, papa iii.	490
Gelasius, papa i.	493
Cæsarius, Arelatensis	499
Paschasius, Romanæ eccles. diaconus	500
Olympiodorus	500
Andreas, Cæsariensis	500
Concilium Agathense	505
Ennodius, Ticinensis	510
Concilium Aurelianense i.	511
Concilium Tarraconense	517
Concilium Gerundense	517
Eusebius, Gallicanus	520
Fulgentius, episc. Ruspensis in Africa	520
Johannes Maxentius	523
Concilium Arelatense iii.	524
Agapetus, diaconus	527
Concilium Arausicanum ii.	529
Concil. Vasense sive Vasionense	529
Concilium Aurelianense ii.	535
Justinianus, imperator	540
Concilium Aurelianense iii.	540
Concilium Aurelianense v.	549
Concil. Constantin. ii. universale v. episcoporum 160	553
Concilium Parisiense ii.	555
Concilium Parisiense iii.	557
Concilium Bracarense i.	563
Cassiodorus, auctor historiæ tripartitæ	570
Concilium Turonense ii.	570
Venantius Fortunatus, episc. Pictaviensis	580
Concilium Cabilonense i.	582
Concilium Matisconense i.	582
Concilium Constantinopol. in quo Johannes Nesteuta illius urbis episc. se universalem appellavit	587

	A.D.
Concilium Matisconense ii. ..	588
Concilium Toletanum iii.	589
Johannes Nesteuta, Constantin.	589
Concilium Narbonense	589
Concilium Autissiodorense ..	590
Evagrius, scholasticus Epiphanensis, historiographus	595
Gregorius, magnus, papa i. ..	600
Gregorius, episc. Turonensis..	600
Concilium Hispalense ii.	619
Isidorus, Hispalensis	630
Concilium Toletanum iv.	633
Concilium Toletanum v.	636
Concilium Toletanum vi.	638
Anastasius, Sinaita	640
Concilium Toletanum vii.	646
Concilium Lateranense	649
Concilium Toletanum viii.	653
Concilium Toletanum ix.	655
Concilium Toletanum x.	656
Concilium Clypiacense	662
Concilium Emeritense	666
Leo ii. papa	675
Concilium Toletanum xi.	675
Concil. Constantin. iii. universale vi. episcoporum 289. ..	681
Concilium Toletanum xii.	681
Concilium Gallicanum	685
Theodorus, archiep. Cantuar...	690
Concilium Anglicanum apud Herudfort	693
Concilium Anglicanum aliud..	694
Isidorus, mercator	710
Beda, monachus Anglicanus..	725
Gregorius, papa ii.	731
Gregorius, papa iii.	740
Johannes Damascenus	740
Concil. Constant. episcoporum 338, contra imagines	754
Ambrosius, Ansbertus	760
Concilium Gentiliacense......	766
Concilium Wormatiense......	776
Concilium de villa Duria	779
Paulus, diaconus et monach. cœnobii Cassinensis	780
Concil. Nicænum ii. universale vii. episcoporum 350.......	787
Epiphanius, diaconus........	787
Alcuinus, monach. et diaconus	790
Concilium Forojuliense	791
Carolus, magnus............	794
Concil. Francofordiense episcoporum 300..............	794
Adrianus, papa iii.	795
Claudius, monachus	800
Concil. Aquisgranense de addita ad symbolum voce Filioque	809
Concilium Arelatense iv.	813
Concilium Turonense iii.	813
Concilium Cabilonense ii.	813
Concilium Maguntiacum	813
Concilium Rhemense........	813
Theophanes, historicus......	814
Concil. Constant. quo Nicæn. ii. condemnatum erat	814
Concil. Parisiense de imaginibus	824
Christianus Druthmarus, presbyter Corbeiensis	830
Amalarius, Lugdunensis [Metensis]	836
Walafridus Strabus	840
Paschasius Radbertus, abbas Corbeiensis	840
Rabanus Maurus, archiep. Moguntinus	844
Haymo, Halberstatensis	844
Johannes Scotus Erigena....	850
Hincmarus, archiep. Rhemens	850
Photius, episc. Constantinop.	860
Anastasius, Bibliothecarius Romanus	860
Concil. Constantinop. iv. univers. viii. episcoporum 102.	869
Albo, Floriacensis abbas	870
Egolismensis monachus, qui Car. magni vitam descripsit	870
Bertramus, al. Ratramnus ..	870
Aimoinus, monach. Gallus ..	873
Concil. Constantinop. dictum etiam œcumenicum, episcoporum 383.	879
Remigius, monachus Antissiodorensis	880
Ado, Viennensis	890
Concilium Triburiense......	895
Regnio, abbas Prumiensis ..	910
Smaragdus, abbas monasterii S. Michaelis	950
Ælfricus, archiep. Cantuar ..	975
Pelegrinus, episc. Laureacens	991
Fulbertus, episc. Carnotensis	1010
Simeon, Metaphrastes	1030
Concilium Parisiense	1033
Œcumenius	1050
Berengarius	1050
Concilium Romanum contra Berengarium............	1050
Concilium Vercellense contra eundem	1050
Concilium Turonense, quo Berengarius sententiam abjurasse dicitur	1055
Concilium Roman. quo Berengarius sententiam iterum abjurasse dicitur	1059

	A.D.
Lanfrancus, archiep. Cantuar.	1060
Algerus, monachus Corbeiensis, al. Cluniacensis	1060
Bertoldus, presb. Constantiens.	1060
Radulphus, Ardent.	1060
Theophylactus, archiep. Bulgarorum.	1070
Guitmundus, episc. Aversanus	1070
Concil. Winton. sub Lanfranco	1075
Euthymius, Zigabenus.	1080
Micrologus	1080
Lambertus, Schafnaburgensis	1080
Anselmus, archiep. Cantuar. .	1095
Concilium Anglicanum.	1095
Edinerus, qui vitam Anselmi descripsit	1095
Sigebertus, monach. Gemblacensis	1100
Ivo, Carnotensis	1100
Zacharias, Chrysopolitanus . .	1100
Odo, Cameracensis	1100
Concilium Londinense	1102
Anselmus, Laudunensis	1110
Calixtus, papa	1120
Johannes Zonaras, monach. Græcus	1120
Concil. Lateranense i. [generale]	1122
Concilium Londinense	1125
Rupertus, abbas Tuitiensis . .	1125
Hugo de S. Victore	1130
Bernardus, abbas Clarevallens.	1130
Concilium Northamptoniense	1138
Concilium Londinense......	1138
Concilium Lateranense ii. . .	1139
Henricus, Huntingtoniensis. .	1140
Gulielm. Malmesburiensis . .	1140
Petrus Lombardus, episc. Parisiensis	1140
Concilium Rhemense	1148
Petrus, Blesensis	1160
Concilium Anglicanum apud novum Mercatum.	1161
Concilium Clarendonense. . . .	1164
Concil. Northampton. quo Th. Cantuar. condemnatus est. .	1164
Hugo, Etherianus.	1166
Gratianus, monach. Bononiens.	1170
Concilium Lateranense iii. . .	1179
Theodorus Balsamon, patriarcha Antiochenus	1180
Innocentius, papa iii.	1200
Gilbertus, monachus.	1200
Johannes Beleth	1200
Petrus, abbas Cluniacensis . .	1200
Robertus de Monte	1210
Nicetas, Choniates.	1210
Concilium Lateranense iv. . .	1215
Concilium Oxoniense	1222
Alexander de Hales, Anglicus	1240
Albertus, Magnus.	1240
Concilium Lugdunense i.	1245
Matthæus, Parisiensis	1250
Humbertus, prædicator	1250
Thomas, Aquinas	1260
Bonaventura, Patavinus	1260
Concilium Lugdunense ii. . .	1274
Petrus de Tarantasia.	1275
Gulielmus Duranti, episcop. Mimacensis	1280
Richardus de media Villa. . . .	1280
Nicephorus Callistus, historiographus	1303
Concilium Viennense	1311
Nicolaus, Lyranus	1320
Petrus de Palude	1330
Thom. Bradwardinus	1340
Matthæus, Westmonaster . .	1380
Concilium Constantiense	1413
Concilium Basiliense	1431
Concilium Ferrariense	1438
Concilium Florentinum	1439
Marcus, Ephesius.	1440
Flavius Blondus	1440
Johannes Hardingus	1465
Johannes de Turrecremata . .	1468
Gabriel Biel	1480
Pomponius Lætus.	1490
Jacobus Perez de Valentia . .	1490
Concilium Lateranense v. . .	1512
Polydorus Vergilius	1533
Concilium Tridentinum inchoatum	1545
Claudius vel Glaudius, rex Æthiopiæ	1557
Concilium Londinense	1562

Μόνῳ δόξα Θεῷ.

AUTHORS

REFERRED TO IN THE NOTES.

ABARBANEL. נחלת אבות. fol. Constant. 1511.

ABEN EZRA. Liber יסוד מורא. 8vo. Constant. 1580.

ABUCARA, (Theodorus) episc. Contra hæret. opuscula; Gr. Lat. interpr. Turriano. 4to. Ingolst. 1606.

ACACIUS, archiep. Constantin. Explanationes, apud Catenam in Pent., cura *Zephyri*, quem videas.

ÆLFRIC, archbp. of Canterbury. Epist. ad Wulffine, bp. of Scyrburne: Sax. Engl. Lat. 8vo. Lond.

AGAPETUS, diac. Scheda regia de officio boni pr. cum notis J. Brunonis. 8vo. Lips. 1669.

AIMONIUS, monach. S. Germ. de pratis. De gestis Francorum. fol. Par. 1602.

ALBERTUS Magnus, episc. Ratisp. De sententiis libri quatuor. fol. Basil. 1506.

ALCUINUS, Anglus. Opera. fol. Lut. Par. 1617.

ALES, (Alexander de) Anglus, doctor irrefragabilis. Universæ theologiæ summa. 2 voll. fol. Col. Agr. 1622.

ALGERUS. De sacramento corporis ac sang. Dom. vol. XXI. Max. Bibl. *Patr.*, q. v.

ALLATIUS, (Leo) bibliothecarius Vaticanus. De ecclesiæ occid. et orient. consensione. 4to. Col. Agr. 1648.

AMALARIUS, Fortunatus, Metensis. De eccles. officiis; vol. XIV. Max. Bibl. *Patr.*, q. v.

AMBROSIUS, episc. Mediol. Opera: ed. Benedict. 2 voll. fol. Par. 1690.

AMMONIUS. De similibus et dissimilibus vocabulis: ad fin. Scapulæ Lex. ed. Oxon. 1820.

ANASTASIUS, S.R.E. biblioth. Historia de vitis R. pontific. 4to. Mogunt. 1602.

ANDREAS, Cæsar. Cappad. archiep. Comm. in Apoc. Gr. Lat. ad calc. vol. X. Opp. Chrysost. Par. 1621.

ANGLICARUM (Rerum) scriptores post Bedam, &c. fol. Francof. 1601.

ANSBERTUS, (Ambrosius) Gallus, presb. In Apoc. libri decem. fol. Colon. 1536.

ANSELMUS, archiep. Cantuar. Op. fol. Colon. 1573. et, ed. Theoph. Raynaudo, e soc. Jes. fol. Lugd. 1630.

APOSTOLICI (Canones) cum comm. Balsamonis. fol. Par. 1620. et, vol. I. *Beveregii* Synod. q. v. et, vol. I. *Concil.* Harduini, q. v.

AQUINAS, (Thomas.) Opera. 18 voll. fol. Venet. 1594.

——— Comm. in Pauli epistolas. fol. Antv. 1591.

ARISTOTELIS Opera; ex recens. Bekkeri. 11 voll. 8vo. Oxon. e typogr. acad. 1837.

ARNOBIUS, Afer. Adversus gentes. 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1651.

ARUCH; Lexicon Talmudicum, auctore R. *Nathan*, B. Jech. q. v.

ATHANASIUS, archiep. Alexandr. Op. ed. Bened. 2 voll. fol. Par. 1698.

Athenæus. Deipnosoph. edit. Schweighæuser. 14 voll. 8vo. Argent. 1801–7.
Athenagoras, apud *Just.* Mart. q. v.
Aventinus, (Jo.) Annalium Boiorum libri 7. fol. Basil. 1580.
Augustinus, episc. Hippon. Opera. ed. Bened. 11 voll. fol. Par. 1679.
Azorius, e soc. Jesu. Institutionum moralium tomi tres. fol. Par. et Lugd. 1602–13.
Azpilcueta, (Mont.) Navarrus. Opera. 3 voll. fol. Lugd. 1597.

Bail, (M. L.) Summa conciliorum. 2 voll. fol. Par. 1659.
Balsamon, apud *Beveregii* Synod. q. v. et, fol. Par. 1620.
Bandinus, theologus. Sententiarum libri quatuor. 8vo. Lovan. 1557.
Baronius, (Cæs.) Annales eccles. contin. a Bzovio, 19 voll. fol. Antv. 1597–1630; et, cum Continuat. Raynaldi, 38 voll. fol. Lucæ, 1738–59.
Basilius, archiep. Cæsar. Cappad. Opera. 3 voll. Gr. Lat. fol. Par. 1638.
Basilius, Seleuciæ episc. Opera: Gr. Lat. fol. Par. 1621.
Bechai, (R.) ben Joseph. ביאור על התורה Elucid. in legem. fol. Ven. 1566.
Becket, (Thomas) archiep. Cantuar. Vita; per Quadrilogum. 4to. Par. 1495.
Beda, presb. Anglo-Sax. Histor. eccles. Angl. cura Jo. Smith. fol. Cantab. 1722.
———— Opera. 8 voll. fol. Col. Agr. 1612.
Belethus, (Jo.) Rationale divin. officiorum. 8vo. Lugd. 1584.
Bellarminus, (Rob.) E. R. Card. Opera. 7 voll. fol. Ingolst. et Col. Angr. 1601–17.
Bernardus, abbas Clarevallensis. Opera. 2 voll. fol. Par. 1586.
Bertramus, s. **Ratramnus.** De corpore et sanguine Dom. p. 513. Μικροπρεσβυτικοῦ, per H. *Petri*, q. v.
EVEREGIUS, (Gul.) episc. Asaphens. Synodicon, s. Pandectæ canonum apost. et concil. 2 voll. fol. Oxon. 1672.
Biblia sacra Polygl. ed. Walton. 6 voll. fol. Lond. 1657.
Biel, (Gabriel) Commentarii in quatuor libros Sententiarum. 4to. Brix. 1574.
Bigne, (Margarinus de la.) Bibl. *Patrum*, q. v.
Blesensis, (Petrus) archid. Bathon. Opera. fol. Par. 1667.
Blondus, (Flav.) Historia Rom. fol. Bas. 1559.
Bonaventura, S. R. E. Card. Op. 7 voll. fol. Rom. 1588–96.
Bradwardinus, (Th.) archiep. Cantuar. De causa Dei. fol. Lond. 1618.
Bucerus, (Mart.) Metaphrases et enarrationes epistt. D. Pauli. fol. Argent. 1536.
Buxtorfius, (Jo.) Tiberias; s. commentar. Masoret. 4to. Basil. 1620.
———— (Jo.) Synag. Judaica. 8vo. Bas. 1661.
Bzovius, (Fr. Abr.) Annalium eccles. voll. XIII—XIX. post *Baronium*, q. v.

Cabrera, (Petrus de.) Comment. et disput. in tertiam partem Thomæ. fol. Cordubæ, 1602.
Cajetanus, S. R. E. card. Explanatio epistolarum Pauli. 8vo. Lugd. 1556.
Calvinus, (Jo.) Opera. 9 voll. fol. Amst. 1667.
Canones *Apostolici*, q. v.
Canonici (Bibliotheca juris) veteris, opera H. Justelli. 2 voll. fol. Lut. Par. 1661.
Carolus, Magnus. Imperialia decreta de cultu imaginum. 8vo. Francof. 1608.
Cassander, (Geo.) Consultatio de artic. fidei inter. Pap. et Protest. 8vo. Col. 1577.
Cassianus, (Joan.) Eremita. Collationes patrum, &c. [una cum *Damasceni* Operibus,] q. v. et, Op. fol. Atreb. 1628.
Cassiodorus, Senator. Historia eccles. tripartita; inter Auctores hist. eccles. fol. Basil. 1528.
Catechismus ad parochos, ex decreto concilii Trid. 8vo. Lugd. 1669.

Chrysologus. Sermones; apud *Hept*. præsul. Christ. q. v.
Chrysostomus, (Jo.) archiep. Constant. Opera. 8 voll. fol. Etonæ, 1612.
——— Comment. in Matt. adscripta Chrys. vol. vi. ed. Bened. 13 voll. cura Montf. fol. Par. 1718–34.
——— Liturgia, s. divina missa, vol. ii. Bibl. vet. *Patr*. q. v.
Claudius, Æthiopiæ rex. Confessio fidei; Æth. Lat. 4to. Lugd. 1661.
Claudius Marius *Victorinus*, monachus, q. v.
Clemens Alexandrinus. Op. ed. J. Potter, episc. Ox. 2 voll. fol. Oxon. 1715.
Clemens Romanus. Epistolæ: p. 345. Op. fol. Col. Agr. 1570.
——— Epist. ad Cor. I. ed. P. Junio. 4to. Oxon. 1633.
——— Constitut. ex recens. Clerici. 2 voll. fol. Antv. 1698.
——— et, inter *Patres* apostol. cura Cotelerii, q. v.
——— Recognitionum liber; p. 390. *Patr*. apost. cura Cotelerii, q. v.
Coccius, (Jodocus.) Thesaurus catholicus. 2 voll. fol. Colon. 1600.
Combefis, (Franc.) Historia hæres. monothel. fol. Par. 1648.
Concilia, cura Harduini. 11 voll. fol. Par. 1715.
——— e typogr. reg. 37 voll. fol. Par. 1644.
——— antiqua Galliæ, cura Sirmondi. 3 voll. fol. Par. 1629.
——— Magnæ Brit. et Hib. cura D. Wilkins. 4 voll. fol. Lond. 1737.
Costerus, (Francisc.) e soc. Jesu. Enchiridion controversiarum de religione. 8vo. Lugd. 1604.
Covarruvias, (Did.) episc. Segob. Opera. fol. Lugd. 1606.
Crashaw, (W.) Fiscus papalis; s. catalogus indulgentiarum 7 eccles. Romæ; translated by W. C. 4to. Lond. 1621.
Cyprianus, episc. Carthag. Opera. fol. Oxon. 1682.
——— ed. Bened. fol. Par. 1726.
Cyrillus, Alexandrinus, Opera. 6 voll. fol. Lutet. 1638.
Cyrillus, Hierosol. archiep. Op. Gr. Lat. cura T. Milles. fol. Oxon. 1703.

Damascenus, (Jo.) Op. Gr. Lat. fol. Bas. 1559.
Damasus, (Wilh.) Lindanus. Panoplia evangelica. fol. Col. Agr. 1575.
Decretales *Gregorii IX*. P. M. q. v.
Decretum *Gratiani*, q. v.
Dionysius, Areopagita. Opera, Gr. Lat. cura Corderii. 2 voll. fol. Antv. 1634.
Dioscorus, patriarcha Alex. Liturgia, Æth. et Lat., ad calc. *Claudii* regis Confess. q. v.
Du Chesne Historia Francorum scriptorum. 4 voll. fol. Lut. Par. 1636—41.
Durandus, (Gul.) Rationale divinorum officiorum. 8vo. Lugd. 1584.

Edinerus, Anglus. Vita *Anselmi* archiep. Opp. præfixa, q. v.
Elias Levita, Gram. תשבי Thisbites. 4to. Isnæ, 1541.
——— Lib. מסורת המסורת. 4to. Ven.
Ennodius, episc. Ticinensis, vol. ix. Max. Bibl. *Patr*. q. v.
Epiphanii episc. Opera, Gr. Lat. ex rec. Petavii. 2 voll. fol. Colon. 1682.
Evagrius, scholasticus Epiphaniensis. Apud *Hist*. eccles. ed. Valesio et Reading, q. v.
Eugenius, episc. Carthag. De cathol. fide; vol. viii. Bibl. Max. *Patr*. q. v.
Eusebius, Emissenus. Homiliæ; vol. vi. Max. Bibl. *Patr*. q. v.
Eusebius, Pamph. episc. Cæsar. Hist. eccles. ed. F. A. Heinichen. 3 voll. 8vo. Lips. 1827, 8.
——— De vita Constantini; ad calc. *Hist*. eccl. Vales. et G. Reading, q. v.
——— Oratio de laudibus Constantini. *Ibid*.
——— De demonstratione evangelica. fol. Par. 1628.
Eustathius, archiep. Thessal. Comm. in Homeri Il. 3 voll. fol. Flor. 1730.
Euthymius, Zigabenus. In quatuor evangelia. 8vo. Par. 1560.

Faustinus, presb. De fide; vol. v, Max. Bibl. *Patr*. q. v.

Felix, (Minutius) Octavius; ed. Lindner. 8vo. Langosalissæ, 1773.

Fischerus, (Joh.) episc. Roffensis. Opera. fol. Wirceb. 1697.

Fortunatus, (Venantius.) Inter Monum. patrum orthodoxogr. ed. *Grynæo*, q. v. et, vol. x. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

Francorum (Annales) apud *Du Chesne*, q. v.

Fulbertus, Carnotensis episc. Epistolæ; vol. xviii. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

Fulgentius, Afer, episc. Opera. 4to. Par. 1684.

Gelasius, papa. De duabus naturis in Christo; vol. viii. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

Gelasius, Cyzicenus episc. Commentar. Actor. conc. Nicæni, Gr. Lat. 8vo. Par. 1599.

Gennadius, Massiliensis presb. De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus. 4to. Hamb. 1614.

Gerson, (Jo.) Cancellar. Paris. Opera. 2 voll. fol. Par. 1606.

Gratianus. Decretum: cum var. glossis et expos. fol. Lugd. 1572.

Gregorius I. Magnus, papa. Opera; ed. Bened. 4 voll. fol. Par. 1705.

Gregorius IX. pont. max. Decretales. fol. Lugd. 1571.

Gregorius, Cæsariens. Oratio de 318 patrib. Nicæ, per Combefis. fol. Par. 1648.

Gregorius, Nazianz. Op. Gr. Lat. ed. Billio. 2 voll. fol. Par. 1630.

Gregorius, Neocæsariensis. In Ecclesiasten; vol. i. Monum. patr. orthod. ed. *Grynæo*, q. v.—Opera. fol. Par. 1621.

Gregorius, Nyssen. Op. Gr. Lat. 3 voll. fol. Par. 1638.

Gregorius, Thaumaturgus, vel, *G. Neocæsariensis*, q. v.

Gregorius, Turonensis. De gloria martyrum; vol. xi. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

—— Historia Gallorum, s. Francorum, fol. Par. 1512.

Gretserus, (Jacobus) e soc. Jesu. Hist. ord. Jesuit. ab El. Hasenmillero. 4to. Ingolst. 1594.

Grotius, (H.) Excerpta ex tragœd. et comœd. Gr. 4to. Par. 1626.

Grynæus, (Jac.) Monumenta s. patrum orthodoxographa. 2 voll. fol. Basil. 1569.

Guitmundus, archiep. Aversanus. De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia: p. 440. vol. xviii. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

Gulielmus Malmsburiensis; apud Rerum *Anglicarum* scriptores post Bedam, &c. q. v.

Haymo, Halberst. episc. In epistt. D. Pauli. 8vo.——1534.

—— Comment. in Apocal. 8vo. Par. 1535.

Henricus, archidiac. Huntingdon. De hist. Angl.; apud Rerum *Anglicarum* scriptores, q. v.

Heptas præsulum Christ. fol. Lugd. 1633.

Hermas. Pastor: inter Opera *Patrum*, Apostol. q. v.

Hesychius, presb. Hierosol. In Leviticum libri septem. fol. Basil. 1527.

Hieronymus. Opera, studio Villarsii. 11 voll. fol. Veron. 1734–1742.

Hilarius. Ed. Bened. fol. Par. 1693.

Hincmarus, archiep. Remensis. Opera, cura Sirmondi. 2 voll. fol. Par. 1645.

Histor. eccles. Gr. Lat. cura H. Valesii et G. Reading. 3 voll. fol. Cantab. 1720.

Historia Ecclesiastica Magdeb. 8 voll. fol. Basil. 1560–1574.

Hugo de *Sancto Victore*, q. v.

Humbertus de Sylva candida, episc. Contra Græcorum calumnias: vol. xviii. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

Jacobus I. Angliæ rex. His works. fol. Lond. 1616.

Ignatius. Epistolæ, ed. Usserii. 4to. Oxon. 1644.

—— ed. Vossii. 4to. Amstel. 1646.

Indulgentiarum Catalogus 7 ecclesiarum Romæ; transl. by Will. *Crashaw*, q. v.

Innocentius III. papa. De s. altaris mysterio. 8vo. Antv. 1550.

Joannes Sarisburiensis. Epistolæ. 4to. Par. 1611.

Jobus, monachus. De verbi incarnatione. p. 578. *Photii* Myriobiblon, q. v.

Josephus, (Flav.) Opera; ed. Hudson. Gr. Lat. fol. Oxon. 1720.

Irenæus. Contra hæreses; ed. Bened. fol. Par. 1710.

Isidorus, Hisp. Op. fol. Par. 1601.

——— Pelusiota. Epistolarum libri quinque. fol. Par. 1638.

Juchasin, Liber; auctore R. Abrah. *Zacuth*, q. v.

Juellus, (Jo.) episc. Sarisb. Opera. fol. Genev. 1585.

Ivo, Carnotensis episc. Decretum: thesaurus eccl. disciplinæ. fol. Lovan. 1561.

Junilius, episc. Africanus. In Genes. comm. vol. vi. S. Bibl. *Patr*. Par. 1575, q. v.

Justellus, (H.) Biblioth. juris *Can*. vet. q. v.

Jus Græco-Romanum canon. et civ. cura Leunclavii. 2 voll. fol. Francof. 1596.

Justinus Martyr. Opera. fol. Par. 1742.

Justinianus, (Bened.) e soc. Jesu. In omnes Pauli epistt. 2 voll. fol. Lugd. 1613.

Justinianus, Imperator. Authent. s. Novellæ; Gr. Lat. fol. Antv. 1575.

Lactantius, ed. Dufresnoy. 2 voll. 4to. Lut. Par. 1748.

Lætus, (Pomponius.) Romanæ hist. compendium; apud *Romanæ* s. Augustæ hist. scriptores minores, q. v.

Lambertus, Schafnaburgensis. Germanorum res gestæ. 8vo. Tubin. 1533.

Lanfranc, archiep. Cantuar. Contra Berengarium; apud H. *Petri* *Μικροπρεσβυτικὸν*, q. v.

Laurentius, Barrensis. Historia Christiana veterum patrum. fol. Par. 1583.

Laymannus, (Paulus) e soc. Jesu. Theologia moralis. 2 voll. 4to. Monachii, 1625.

Leo I. Magnus, papa. Opera omnia, cum notis Quesnellii. 2 voll. 4to. Lut. Par. 1675.

——— Epistola ad Flavianum; p. 144. Miscell. sanctorum aliquot patr., auct. *Vossio*, q. v.

Leo X. papa. Decret.; apud M. *Lutheri* Op. q. v.

Leontius, Byzantinus. De sectis. 8vo. Basil. 1578.

Lindanus, (Wilhelmus) i. e. Wilh. *Damasus* Lindanus, q. v.

Liturgiæ antiq. viz. Chrysost., Basil., Marc., Petri, &c. vol. ii. Bibl. vet. *Patr*. fol. Par. 1624, q. v.

Lombardus, (P.) Sententiarum libri. 8vo. Par. 1564.

Lucretius; ed. Creech. 8vo. Oxon. 1807.

Lutherus, (Mart.) Opera. 7 voll. fol. Witteb. 1550–7.

Lyra, (Nic. de) Biblia; cum glossa ord. 6 voll. fol. Lugd. 1589.

Macarius, Ægyptius. Homiliæ; ed. J. Geo. Pritio. 8vo. Lips. 1698.

Maimonides, (R. Moses) Comm. in Mishn. fol. Ven. 1606.

——— ——— De fundamentis legis. Hebr. Lat. per Vorstium. 4to. Amst. 1638.

——— ——— יד חזקה. 2 voll. fol. Ven. 1550, 1.

Marcus, eremita. Opera; vol. i. Bibl. vet. *Patr*. fol. Par. 1624. q.v.

Maronitarum, (Officium septem dierum hebdomadæ, juxta usum ecclesiæ.) 8vo. Romæ, 1647.

Mauritius, (Petrus) abbas Cluniacensis. Contra hæreticos Petrobrusianos. 4to. Ingolst. 1546.

Maxentius, (Joan.) presb. Antioch. vol. ix. Max. Bibl. *Patr*. q. v.

Maximus, Taurinensis episc.; inter *Hept*. præsul. Christ. q. v.

Mediavilla, (Richardus de.) Super quatuor libros Sententiarum P. Lomb. 4 voll. fol. Brix. 1591.

Micrologus, (Joan.) De eccles. observationibus; vol. xviii. Max. Bibl. *Patr*. q. v.

Midrash Tehillim; מדרש תהל״: exercitatio in Psal. magna. fol. Ven. 1546.

ΜΙΚΡΟΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΙΚΟΝ: cura H. *Petri*, q. v.

Monte, (Robertus de.) Append. ad Chronogr. Sigeberti; vol. i. Scriptorum rerum German. Jo. *Pistorii*, q. v.

Nathan, (R.) ben Jechiel. ם״ הערוך

Aruch; lex. Talmudicum. fol. Ven. 1653.

NAVARRUS, (Mart.) *Azpilcueta*, q.v.

NICETAS Acominatus Choniat. Imperii Græci Historia: Gr. Lat. a Wolfio. 4to. Genev. 1593.

—— Thesaurus orthodoxæ fidei; P. Morello interpr. 8vo. Lut. 1580.

NICEPHORUS Callistus. Hist. eccl. Gr. Lat. cum interpr. J. Langii. 2 voll. fol. Par. 1630.

NILUS, monachus. Capita parænetica; vol. VII. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

ODO, episc. Cameracensis. Explicatio s. canonis missæ; vol. XXI. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

ŒCUMENIUS. Commentt. in N.T. Gr. Lat. 2 voll. fol. Par. 1631.

OLYMPIODORUS, monachus. In ecclesiast.; apud Monum. patr. orthodox. ed. *Grynæo*, q. v.

OPTATUS, Milevitanus episc. Opera. fol. Par. 1679.

ORIGENES. Opera; ed. Bened. 4 voll. fol. Par. 1733–59.

—— Op. fol. Par. 1604.

ORPHEI Carmina; ed. Hermanno. 8vo. Lips. 1805.

PACIANUS, Barcil. episc. Epistolæ 3 ad Sympr. vol. IV. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q.v.

PALUDE, (Petrus de.) In quartum Sententiarum. fol.

PANIGAROL, vel PANICAROLA, (Franc.) episc. Hastens. Disceptationes Calvinicæ. 4to. Mediol. 1594.

PAREZ, (Jacob.) de Valentia. Expositiones in Psal. Cant. &c. fol. Par. 1518.

PARIS, (Matthæus) Anglus. Historia major; ed. W. Watts. fol. Lond. 1640.

PASCHASIUS. De corpore et sang. Domini. 8vo. Colon. 1550.

PATRES apostolici: ed. Cotelerii. fol. Lut. Par. 1672.

PATRUM, (Bibl. veterum.) 3 voll. fol. Par. 1624.

PATRUM (S. Bibliotheca), 8 voll. fol. Par. 1575.

—— Append. Bibl. fol. Par. 1579.

PATRUM, (Maxima Bibliotheca.) 28 voll. fol. Lugd. 1677.

PAULINUS, episc. vol. VI. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

PAULUS, diaconus. De gestis Langobardorum; vol. XIII. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

PELEGRINUS, archiep. Laureac. vol. XVII. Max. Bibl. *Patr.* q. v.

PELUSIOTA, i. e. *Isidorus* Pel. q. v.

PETRI, (H.) Μικροπρεσβυτικόν: Veterum brev. theol. elenchus. fol. Basil. 1550.

PETRUS *Mauritius*, Cluniacensis abbas, q. v.

PHILASTRIUS, episc. Brixiensis. Hæresium catalogus. 4to. Helmst. 1611.

PHILO, Judæus. Opera; ed. Mangey. 2 voll. fol. Lond. 1742.

PHOCYLIDES: ed. Bandinio. 8vo. Flor. 1766.

PHOTIUS, patriar. Constantinop. De septem œc. synod. p. 1141. Bibl. jur. *Can.* vet. q. v.; et, p. 263. ed. 4to. Par. 1615.

—— Myriobiblon, seu Bibliotheca. fol. Par. 1611.

PINDARI Carmina; ed. Heyne. 3 voll. 8vo. Lips. 1817.

PISTORIUS, (Joan.) Scriptores rerum German. 2 voll. fol. Francof. 1683, 4.

PITHŒUS, (Petr.) Opera. 4to. Par. 1609.

PLATINA. De vitis pontif. Rom. fol. Lovan. 1572; et, Colon. Ub. 1600.

PLINIUS, (C.) Secundus. Hist. nat.; interpr. et not. Harduini. 5 voll. 4to. Par. 1685.

PLUTARCHI Opera; ed. Wyttenbach. 8 voll. 4to. Oxon. e typog. Clar. 1795–1830.

POETÆ Gr. vet. heroici carm. fol. Aurel. Allobr. 1606.

POLYCARPUS. Epist. ad Philipp. cum *Ignatii* Epistt. q. v.

PRIMASIUS, Uticensis episc. In S. Pauli epistolas comm. 8vo. Par. 1543.

PROSPER, Aquitanicus. Opera. 8vo. Col. Agrip. 1609; et, p. 887. Cassiani Op. 1628; et, p. 170. App. vol. X. *Augustini* Op. q.v.

PRUDENTIUS, (Aur.) Opera. 2 voll. 4to. Parm. 1788.

RABANUS Maurus. Opera. 6 voll. fol. Colon. Agr. 1626.

Raynaldus, (Od.) Continuatio Annal. eccles. *Baronii*, q. v.

Regino, (vel Rhegino,) abbas. Annales; p. 1. vol. 1. *Pistorii* Scriptt. rer. Germ. q. v.

Remigius, episc. vol. viii. Max. Bibl. *Patr*. q. v.

Robertus de *Monte*, q. v.

Romæus, (Franciscus.) De libertate operum et necessitate. 4to.

Romanæ, s. Augustæ historiæ Scriptores minores; cura Sylburgii. 3 voll. fol. Francof. 1588.

Ruffinus. Expos. in symbol. ad calc. *Cypriani*, cura Fell, p. 17. q. v.

———— Præf. ad libr. Recognitionum *Clementis* Rom. q. v.

Rupertus, abbas Tuitiensis. Opera. 2 voll. fol. Col. Agr. 1602.

Salmeron, (Alfonsus.) Commentarii in epist. Paul. 4 voll. 4to. Col. Agr. 1604.

Salvianus, Massiliens. pres. De gubernatione Dei, &c. 8vo. Oxon. 1633.

Sancto Victore, (Hugo de.) Speculum de mysteriis ecclesiæ; p. 148. vol. iii. Opp. fol. Ven. 1588.

Savile, (sir Henry.) Rerum *Angl.* scriptores, &c. q. v.

Scotus, (Jo. Duns.) In libr. Sententiarum Reportata Petri *Tatareti*, q. v.

Sedulius, presb. In epistt. Pauli Collectaneum. fol. Basil. 1528.

Seneca, (Luc. et Marc.) Opera. 3 voll. 8vo. Amst. 1672. et, 5 voll. ed. Bipont. 8vo. Argent. 1810.

Sibyllina orac. vol. iii. Bibl. vet. *Patr.* q. v.

Sidonius, (C. Sollius) Apoll. Arvern. episc. Epistolæ; vol. i. *Sirmondi* Op. q. v.

Sigebertus, Gemblacensis. Chronicon; p. 401. Hist. Christianæ vet. pat. *Laurentii* Barrens. q. v.

———— Chronographia; vol. i. Scriptt. rerum Germ. per *Pistorium*, q. v.

Sirmondus, (Jac.) *Concilia* antiq. Galliæ, q. v. Opera. 5 voll. fol. *Par.* 1696.

Socrates, Byzantinus. Hist. eccles., apud *Hist*. Eccles. Gr. Lat. Vales. et Reading, q. v.

Sophocles. Tragœd. ed. Dindorfii. 8vo. Oxon. 1832.

Soto, (Dominicus) Segobicus. De natura et gratia. fol. Antv. 1550.

Soto, (Petrus de.) Lectiones de institutione sacerdotum. 8vo. Lugd. 1587.

Sozomen, Salaminius. Hist. eccl., apud *Hist*. Eccles. Gr. Lat. Vales. et Reading, q. v.

Sparrow, (Anth.) Collection of Articles, Injunctions, &c. 4to. Lond. 1675.

Stapleton, (Thomas.) Promptuarium catholicum. 8vo. Par. 1617.

Strabo, (Walafridus) abbas. De exordiis et incr. rerum eccl. 8vo. Ven. 1572.

Suarez, (Franc.) e soc. Jesu. Comm. in iii. partem Thomæ. 4 voll. fol. Compl. 1590.

Synodis, (Anonymi liber de sex œc.) p. 1161. Photii, apud Bibl. jur. *Can*. vet. q. v.

Talmud Babyl. 10 voll. fol. Ven. 1522.

Talmud Hierosol. fol. Ven.

Tataretus, s. Tartaretus, (Petrus.) Reportata in Sententias Jo. Duns Scoti. fol. Ven. 1607.

Tatianus, Syrus. Oratio ad Græcos; Gr. Lat. ed. Worth. 4to. Oxon. 1700.

Tertullianus, Carthag. presb. ed. Semler. 6 voll. 8vo. Halæ, 1825–8.; et, 5 voll. fol. Rothom. 1662.

Theodoretus. Opera; ed. Sirmondi. 5 voll. fol. Par. 1642–84.

Theodorus, Lector. Libri Collect. inter Scriptt. *Hist*. Eccles. Vales. et Reading, q. v.

Theophanes. Chronographia; ex rec. Combefis. fol. Par. 1655.

Theophilus, Alex. archiep. Edicta et canones: vol. ii. *Beveregii* Synod. q. v.

Theophilus, Antioch. episc. Libri tres ad Autolychum, Gr. Lat. ed. Wolfio. 8vo. Hamb. 1724.

Theophylactus. In quat. evang. fol. Par. 1631.

———— In Act. apost. Gr. Lat. fol. Col. 1568.

———— In Pauli epistt. fol. Lond. 1636.

Thucydides. Gr. ed. Poppo. 8vo. Lips. 1825, &c.

Turrecremata, (Joan. de.) Quæstiones super evangeliis. 8vo. Lugd. 1509.

Urstisius, (Ch.) Germaniæ historici illustres. fol. Francof. 1585.

Usserius, (J.) archiep. Armach. De ecclesiarum successione et statu; edit. sec. fol. Lond. 1687.

——— De Romanæ ecclesiæ symbolo diatriba. 4to. Oxon. 1660.

Valentia, (Gregorius de.) De rebus fidei controversis. fol. Lugd. 1591.

Venantius Honorius Clementianus *Fortunatus*, episc. Pictav. q. v.

Vergilius, (Polydore.) Angliæ historiæ libri 27. fol. Bas. 1570.

——————— De rerum inventione. 8vo. Lugd. Bat. 1644.

Victorinus, (Cl. Marius.) Commentt. in Genes. 8vo. Par. 1560.

Vincentius, Burgundus, præsul Bellovacensis. Speculum historiale, IV. vol. Spec. maj. fol. Ven. 1591.

Vincentius, Lirinensis. Commonitorium adv. hæres. 8vo. Oxon. 1631.

Vossius, (Gerard.) Borchlonius. Miscellanea sanc. aliquot patrum Græcorum et Lat. 4to. Mog. 1604.

Walafridus Strabo, abbas; v. W. *Strabo*.

Westmonasteriensis, (Matthæus.) Flores historiarum præcip. de rebus Brit. fol. Francof. 1601.

Wilkins, (Dav.) *Concilia* Magnæ Brit. et Hib. q. v.

Xenophanes, Colophonius; inter poet. ed. Steph. 8vo. Par. 1573.

Zacharias, episc. Chrysopol. De concordia evangelistarum libr. quat. fol. 1535.

Zacuth, (R. Abraham.) Juchasin. 4to. Cracov. 1581.

Zephyrus, (Fr.) Catena locorum in Pent. 8vo. Col. Agr. 1572.

The Citations from the Fathers as made by Bp. Beveridge having been found to vary considerably from the Editions above stated, it has been deemed expedient to subjoin a collation of these Editions with the MS. of Bp. Beveridge.

The lines are reckoned from the bottom.

Pag. lin.	MS.	ED.
7. 15.	qua summa	qua summum *Anselm.* p. 85.
7. 20.	*τὰ ταῦτα τοῦ*	*τὰ πάντα τοῦ Athanas.* I. 6.
7. 13.	*ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἀγένητοί τε καὶ γενητοὶ, οὐχ ὅμοιοι*	*ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἀγένητοι οὐχ ὅμοιοι Athenag.* p. 285.
8. 6.	Virtutis autem perfecta natura non potest esse nisi in eo in quo totum est, non in eo in quo pars	Virtutis autem perfectior natura potest esse in eo, in quo totum est, quam in eo, in quo pars *Lactan.* I. p. 10.
35. 7.	Apostolus mentiri seipsum non potest; quoniam multa non potest.	Apostolus negare seipsum non potest. Quam multa non potest. *August.* VI. i. 2.
35. 16.	faciat ut ea quæ vera sunt, eo ipso quod vera sunt, falsa sint.	faciat ut ea quæ vera sunt, eo ipso quo vera sunt, falsa sint. *Aug.* VIII. 26. 5.
54. 3.	*καὶ τὴν διανομὴν*	*καὶ τὴν διαμονὴν Chrysost.* I. 63.
54. ult.	*κόσμον*	*χρόνον* marg. *κόσμον Id. ib.*
57. 19.	*ῥεύματι*	*νεύματι Athanas.* 43, 44.
63. 4.	vidi	vidit *Aug.* III. ii.
65. 23.	et tres	et hi tres *Cypr.* p. 109.
69. 3.	nec distincte tria	nec disjuncte tria *Aug.* II. p. 609.
70. 13.	in natura unus est	in una natura unus est. *Aug.* VI. *App.* pp. 19. 20.
70. 17.	et simul omnes una substantia	*caret, Alc.* p. 709.
70. 13.	Ita etiam quicquid est Filius in eo quod Deus est	Ita etiam et Filius eo quod Deus est *Alc.* p. 709.
70. 7.	hoc Pater	*caret, Id. ib.*
75. 27.	nemo novit; non hæretici omnes, neque angeli	nemo novit; non Valentinus non Marcion neque Saturninus neque Basilides, neque angeli *Iren.* l. 2.
76. 4.	dicimus de Deo	dicimus Deum de Deo *Aug.* III. in Joh. tr. 31.
77. 19.	*κρείττων ἐστὶν*	*κρείττων μου ἐστὶν Athanas. contr. Ar.*
78. 12.	*ἀποδημίας*	*ἐπιδημίας Id. ib.*
79. 8.	Confitemur unigenitum Dei filium	Confitemur unigenitum Deum filium *Conc. Vien.* VII.
82. 14.	*ἐκ σοφοῦ σοφὸς*	*ἐκ σοφοῦ σοφία Athan.* I. 618.
82. 12.	*αὐτοδύναμιν*	*αὐτοδύναμον Theodor.* IV. 712.
85. 18.	qui apud Patrem	quam apud Patrem *August.* III. ii.
85. 14.	humanæ	*caret, Hilar. de Trin.*
85. 13.	sed non Dei forma	*caret* non *Id. ib.*

88. 3. *ἐνωθείς ἐστι*	*ἐνωθεὶς Χριστός ἐστι Athanas. de Trin.*
88. ult. *πρὸς ἑκάτερον*	*πρὸς ἑκατέρους Iren.* III. 20.
91. 8. mortuus	*caret, Aug.* VIII. p. 629.
92. 21. ab eo qui pater est	ab eo patre qui est *Hilar. de Trin.*
92. 9. videt. . . . . . videt	vidit. . . . vidit *Id. ib.*
95. 10. *ἐκ τοῦ τῆς παρθένου αἵματος*	*ἐκ τῶν τῆς παρθένου σπερμάτων Ignat. ad Trall.*
95. 4. *ἄνθρωπος*	*caret, Athanas. contr. Arr.*
95. 4. *τοῦ σωτῆρος*	*τοῦ κυρίου Id. epist. ad Epict.*
96. 20. quia hominem a	qui hominem a *August. contr. Ar.*
96. 15. qui in tempore	qui ex tempore *Id. ib.*
96. 23. *λογίσῃ*	*λογίζου Chrysost. εἰς τὸν σταυρ.*
96. 19. *ἄρτων—γυναικῶν*	*ἄρτων καὶ δύο ἰχθύων θρέψαντα πεντάκις χιλίους χωρὶς γ. Id. ib.*
96. 11. *καὶ τοῦ σ.—ἀναστήσαντα*	*caret, Id. ib.*
96. 8. *συγκαθήμενον*	*συγκαθεζόμενον Id. ib.*
96. 8. *οἶδα Χριστὸν ὑπὸ—λιθαζ.* Καὶ τὰ	*οἶδα Χριστὸν ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἐμπτυόμενον, καὶ οἶδα Χριστὸν ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων προσκυνόμενον.* Καὶ τὰ *Id. ib.*
96. 5. *τὰ μὲν. . . . τά δε*	*τὸ μὲν. . . . τό δε Id. ib.*
96. 3. *εἰς τὸν τίμιον σταυρὸν*	*εἰς τὸν σταυρὸν Id. ib.*
99. 34. *ἐφ' οὗ*	*ἐφ' ᾧ Just. d. c. Tryph.*
99. 12. *ἐφ' οὗ*	*ἐφ' ᾧ Id. ib.*
101. 28. Item hoc	Idem hoc *Lact. de vera s.*
101. ult. *διὰ τοῦτο*	*διὰ τούτου Just. d. c. Tryph.*
102. 3. publicatur	designabatur *Tert. adv. Jud.*
103. 8. ibidem	inde *August. epist.*
104. 6. *γίνεται διὰ τ. λ.*	*γίνεται ὁδοποιοῦσα διὰ τ. λ. Greg. Nyss. epist.*
110. 3. *θεομακ. πάθους*	*θεομακ. αὐτοῦ π. Ignat. epist.*
112. 9. *ἐπὶ πώλου ἐκάθισεν*	*ἐν πλοίῳ ἐκάθισεν Chrys.* VII.
112. 8. *ὑπὲρ ἄνω τῶν οὐρανῶν καθίσῃ*	*ὑπεράνω τῶν χερουβὶμ καθίσῃ Id. ib.*
112. 7. *ἐβαπτίσθη . . . ἐκοιμήθη*	*ἐβαπτίσθη, ἵνα σε φωτίσῃ· ἐρραπίσθη, ἵνα σε ἐλευθερώσῃ· ὡδοιπόρησεν, ἵνα σε ἄφοβον κατιστήσῃ· ἐκοιμήθη Id. ib.*
112. 1. *ἄνθρωπος . . . . υἱὸν Θεοῦ*	*ἄνθρωπος, ἵνα σε Θεὸν καλέσῃ· ἐκλήθη υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα σε υἱὸν Θεοῦ Id. ib.*
112. 9. *εἰς τὸν τίμιον σταυρόν*	*caret τίμιον Id. ib.*
112. 7. *λέγει καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ*	*λ. ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ Cyr. Alex.* VI.
121. 10. *καὶ τοσούτους ὡς διὰ*	*ἀλλὰ τ. ω. δ.* Orig. con. C.
134. 10. sepultus secus easdem, huic quoque legi	s. secundum easdem, hic q. l. *Tertull. de anima.*
142. 33. corda servanda	c. sananda *Aug. in Joh.*
142. 34. lanx	lancea *Aug. in Joh.*
142. 12. Tenuerunt eos vulnera	Terruerunt e. v. *Id. in Ps.*
142. 25. *ὑπὲρ τῶν κυμάτων*	*ἐπὶ τῶν κ. Chrys.* vol. II.
143. 9. *ἐκράτουν ἑώρων*	*ἐ. καὶ ἑώρων Id. in S. Thom.*
147. 13. quæ diei et dominicæ nuncupatur	quæ diei dominicæ mancipatur *Hieron. in Jon.*
154. 7. *διὰ αὐτὸν χρόνον*	*διὰ τὸν χρόνον Athanas.* I. 69.
156. 5. *Εἴς τε νῦν*	*Εἰς ἔτι νῦν Joseph. Antiq.*
158. 8. f. non sedebat	f. ante non sederat *Ruffin. Symb.*

159. 34. Quæ.... paterna.. .et jam	Quid ... æterna ... etiam *Aug. de Trin.*
159. 21. perfecto, victor adveniens honoris	perfecto, honoris *Max. Taurin.*
162. 9. his quæ in terra	*caret* his *Aug.* IV. 679.
162. 12. ejus per figuram beatus Job sententiam	ejus sententiam *Gregor. hom.* 29.
164. 32. *ἀναλαμβάνεται*	*ἀνελαμβάνετο Chrys.*
168. 3. ea	eam *Aug. Civ. Dei.*
168. 9. *caret τῶν*	*τίνας τῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν Chrys.* III. 265.
169. 3. *καὶ τὸν σφαγέντα*	*τὸ τὸν σφαγέντα Chrys. in Ignat.*
171. 5. sedit	sedet *Id. ib.*
175. 2. Dominum, vivificatorem	D. et vivificatorem *Lomb. Sent.*
177. 5. a patre et filio, sed	ex patre, sed *Ambr. de symb.*
177. 50. est ipse F.	est et ipse F. *Id. ib.*
177. 49. neque Pater——utroque	*caret, Id. ib.*
177. 39. ad filium	in filium *August. de Trin.*
177. 14. de patre filioque	*caret, Vigil. con. Eut.*
177. 5. Neque S. S.	Neque ita S. S. *Eugen. de c. fide.*
178. 16. *ἀεὶ σὺν πατρὶ*	*ἀεὶ ὂν σὺν π. Epiph. Anchor.*
178. 4. *οὖσαν ἐνεργείαν*	*caret οὖσαν Athanas. ad Ser.*
178. 32. Quod si nihil differre cr.	Q. si diff. cr. *Hilar. de Trin.*
182. 5. sanctificatione	signatione *Faustin. de fide.*
184. 8. *ἐνεργοῦν*	*αὐτὸ τὸ ἐνεργοῦν Athenag. π. Χριστ.*
184. 9. *γεννητῶς ἐξέλαμψε*	*caret γεννητῶς Justin. exp. f.*
186. 13. Deus pater, filius,	Deus pater, Deus filius *Max. fid. Conf.*
186. 19. præstantiam	præscientiam *Eugen. de cath. f.*
186. 5. Cum eum operum magnitudo	Cum operum magnitudine *Id. ib.*
198. 8. *ταῖτα λέγοντι*	*ταῦτά σοι λέγοντι Cyr. Hieros.*
198. 10. *πιστεύσασθαι δεῖ*	*πιστώσασθαι δεῖ Clem. Alex.*
198. 9. *ἀναμένωμεν μαρτυρίαν*	*ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν Id. ib.*
199. 10. *πᾶν ῥῆμα καὶ πρᾶγμα.*	*π. ῥῆμα ἢ πρᾶγμα Basil. Moral.*
202. 23. prophetarum	præteritorum proph. *Iren.* III. 21.
202. 7. qui in scriptura fuerat plenus fuit.	qui ante scripta fuerat, plenus fuerit *Aug.* III. ii. Ap.
202. 3. איכה	וקינות *Baba Bathra*
203. 17. *τὰ δικαίως πεπιστευμένα*	*τ. δ. θεῖα πεπιστευμένα Jos. c. Appio.*
203. 6. (al. cum Lamentationibus)	*caret. Hilar. in Ps.*
204. 13. sapient. Athenis	sap. Judæus Athenis *Jacob. de Valent.*
208. 10. in Dei literis	in Dei doctrina *Hieron.* IX.
209. 30. *τὰ μὲν παλαιᾶς δ.*	*τῆς μὲν π. δ. Synod. Bever.*
209. 8. *caret*	*Ἔσδρα δύο Id.*
209. 9. *Ψαλτηρίον ἓν*	*Ψαλτηρίου ἓν Id.*
209. 7. *ἡ Σοφία*	*ἢ καὶ Σοφία Euseb. H. E.*
213. 8. *ἀρχὴ Πᾶσα σοφία παρὰ Κυρίου,* &c.	*ἀρχὴ Ἀγαπήσατε δικαιοσύνην,* &c. *Athanas. Syn. S. S.*
214. 12. atque Ecclesiastes	atque Ecclesiasticus *Lyr. Prolog.*
217. 4. *μόνον*	*μόνων Just. Dial.* c. 7.
225. 3. *ὥστε ἔλεγε*	*ὡσεὶ ἔλεγε. Id.* vol. V.
225. 2. *καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ*	*τὸ καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ. Id. ib.*
225. 4. *καὶ τῇ καινῇ μὲν ἄλλον*	*οἱ τῇ καινῇ μὲν ἄλλον Id. ib.*
228. 11. jam spem salutis	istam spem salutis *Aug.* VIII.
253. 21. vivificatorem	dominum vivificatorem *Concil. Tolet.*

254. 9.	*βεβαίαν μένειν*	*κυρίαν μένειν Soz. eccl. hist.*
254. 3.	*πρός γε τοῦ ὅρου τῶν ἕκατον πεντήκοντα ἁγίων πατέρων* (*ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει*) *ἐπήγαγον*	*πρός γε τῶν ἕκατον πεντήκοντα ἁγίων πατέρων, ἐπήγαγον Evang. hist. eccl.*
255. 12.	contra Theodorum et Theodoritum et eorum dogm.	contra Theodorum et Theodoreti et Ibæ epistolas et eorum dogm. *Conc. Angl. apud Bed. h.*
258. 3.	resurgent	resurgere habent *Symb. Athan.*
259. 20.	nisi quis fideliter	nisi quisque fideliter *Id.*
260. 2.	patriarcha	patriarcha Alexandrino *Durand. Ration.*
262. 5.	nullæ linguæ barbaræ inaccessæ viderentur, et in via præceptum	nulla linguæ barbaries inaccessa videretur et invia; præceptum *Ruff. in symb.*
262. 1.	quasque	quemque *Id.*
262. 20.	normam prædicationis	normam prius futuræ sibi prædicationis *Ruffin. Exp. Symb.*
262. 17.	qui....mutabantur	qui....invitabantur *Id. ib.*
263. 18.	Ipsius......perfecta confessio	Ipsa....perfecta confessio *Leo Epist.*
263. 13.	solo possint gladio	solo ipsius possint gladio *Id. ib.*
263. 2.	Amen *deest*	Vitam æternam. Amen. *Aug. Serm.*
268. 9.	de adultero	de adulterio *Id. Ps.* l. 7.
270. 13.	quia uberius	quia uberibus *Aug. Conf.* I.
270. 20.	de natura vitiata	de natura peccato vitiata *Id. contr. Pelag.*
270. 17.	Quis mihi commemoret peccata	Quis me commemorat peccatum *Aug. Conf.* I. 11.
270. 21.	in remissionem	pro remissione *Orig. in Lev.*
270. 10.	illa....ratio	ulla....ratio *Id. in Luc.*
272. 18.	*τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἡ ἀπάτη διέβη· οὕτω......διεβήσατο*	*ἀνθρώπους ἔφθασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία· οὕτως τοῦ Κυρίου γενομένου ἀνθρώπου, καὶ τὸν ὄφιν διατρέψαντος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἡ τοιαύτη ἴσχυς διαβήσεται Athanas. contr. Ar.* I.
272. 8.	quia non possunt	quia nondum possunt *Aug. contr. P.*
273. 11.	Quamdiu vivis	*caret* vivis *Id. in Joh.*
273. 25.	habendi cum plena immortalitate justitiam	habendi plenam cum immortalitate justitiam *Aug. contr. duas ep. Pelag.*
275. 22.	voluntarie vitiavit, atque oppressit infirmitas, nisi	voluntarie vitiavit atque oppressit ita crevit infirmitas, nisi *Fulgent. de incarn. et gr. Chr.*
275. 17.	Est....bonum; est liberum non tamen sanum; est liberum non tamen justum	Sit....bonum; sit liberum non tamen rectum; sit liberum non tamen sanum: sit liberum non tamen justum *Id. ib.*
278. 3.	Ex lege si ea legitime utamur confugimus ad gratiam? quis autem confugit nisi	Qui ergo legitime lege utitur, discit in ea malum et bonum, et non confidens in virtute sua confugit ad gratiam, quæ præstante declinet a malo et faciat bonum. Quis autem confugit ad gratiam nisi *Aug. de corr. et grat.*
281. 28.	ad audiendum	ad audendum *Prosp. de vocat.*

282. 5. bonum inchoare .... nemo perficere	bonum perficere .... nemo incipere *Aug. contr. duas ep. Pel.*
282. 10. Nam quis nisi	Nam quis nos nisi *Aug. ep.* 186.
283. 2. quia credimus	quia credidimus *Fulgent.*
284. 17. possit	posset *Id.*
184. 12. effundat	infundat *Id.*
285. 7. gratiam .... adjuvare	gratia.... adjuvari *Conc. Afr. ap. Prosp.* p. 890.
289. 20. a facie mea	a salute mea *Aug. in Ps.*
290. 7. sine operibus	s. operibus legis *Hier. adv. P.*
290. 5. ex fide.	ex lege. *Id.*
290. 4. per fidem	ex fide *Id.*
291. 13. Justif. hom. sine op.	J. h. per fidem s. op. *Aug.* 83. Q.
291. 4. bonorum	*caret, Id. ib.*
294. 38. levare peccata	eluere peccata *Ambr. in Ps.*
294. 32. *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*	*εἰς τ. ἀπεράντους αἰ. Macar. Æg.*
294. 20. in hac vita mortali	in hac morte vitali *Petr. Bles.*
295. 21. in fine habebitur	in fine sine fine hab. *Aug. Ep.* 194.
297. 11. ———— sola plenum ad justitiæ et meriti reputata coronam est	————sola Pro virtute fuit, meritisque ornata laboris plenam justitiæ tribuit reputata coronam *Claud. Mar.*
297. 13. ex operibus legis	per opera legis *Ambr. Rom.*
300. 3. asserant fidem sine op. nihil pr.	adstruant fidem sine op. non pr. *Aug.*
300. 18. plane quam evang.	planeque evang. *Ib.*
304. 5. quia credimus	quia credidimus *Fulg.*
307. 10. a peccatis purgat	a peccatis omnibus pur. *Prosper.*
308. 12. si vellent humili	si vellent Deo semper humili *Aug. def.*
309. 10. sed tamen	sed tantum *Soto.*
309. 7. dicitur	attenditur *Romæus.*
313. 33. cum sine fide placere	cui sine fide placere *Aug. Jul. Pel.*
313. 3. animi solida virtus	animi solida magnitudo *Bernard. ser.* 5.
313. 8. percipit	præcipit *Aug. in Joh.*
319. 16. et propriis et	et pro piis et *Clem. VI.*
328. 2. defecit illis v.	deficit illis v. *Aug. de Symb.*
329. 27. sed in eo qui f.	sed ex eo qui f. *Id. ib.*
329. 18. *Ὅρα καὶ τῆς καὶ ἐκει*	*Ὅρα γοῦν καὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐκει Chrys. Matt.*
329. 3. veritas est	vera ita est *Conc. Milev.*
336. 3. de trina majestate	de trina Dei majestate *Aug. Exp. ep.*
346. ult. in charitate testatur	in Christo testatur *Fulg. de inc.*
349. 8. et hoc verum	et hoc vero *Aug. de dono.*
350. 8. atque in ipso cursu	atque ut ipso cursu *Aug. de dono.*
353. 14. ipse est via	ipsa est via *Aug. in J.* 13.
355. 3. *κᾆν δοῦλος*	*ἢ δοῦλος Ign. ad Smyr.*
356. 9. per invocationem et	per invocationem Domini et *Aug. de rect.*
357. 5. *Ἔνθε δὲ καὶ τοῦ δεσπότου κατηγορίας*	*Ἔνθεν καὶ τῆς τοῦ δεσπότου προσηγορίας Euseb. de l. C.*
359. 12. *ἔξουσα καρδίαν*	*ἔχουσα καρδίαν Iren.* I. x. 2.
361. 26. *τ. κ. Ἀλεξ.*	*τ. κ. Ἀλεξ. ἐκκλησίας Socr.* II. 3.
361. 26. bonos et malos congregantibus	bonos et malos pisces pariter congregantibus *Aug.* 13.

361.	18.	mali cum bonis in ea prænunciarentur.	mali bonis in ea permixti prænunciarentur. *Id. ib.*
363.	3.	Ecclesia non enim quæ	Ecclesia autem non est quæ *Hier. adv. L.*
368.	4.	ex sp. privilegio	ex sp. Dei privilegio *can.* 23.
369.	13.	acceptabilis altaris sacrificio	acceptabili altaris sacrificio *C. Trid. sess.* 25.
369.	10.	simpliciter eos invoc.	suppliciter eos invoc. *ibid.*
382.	9.	*ἁγιωτάτης ἑορτῆς*	*ἁγιωτάτης ἡμέρας Euseb. V. C.*
390.	13.	דמפשרין	דמפרשין *Targ. Hieros.*
391.	3.	ולהחזיר את בדק	ולהחזיק את בדק *Abarb. Præf.*
401.	12.	acceptabilis altaris sacrificio	acceptabili altaris sacrificio *Conc. Trid. sess.* 25.
418.	3.	*τῶν ὅλων π. θεὸν*	*τὸν τῶν ὅλων π. θεὸν* Theodor.
420.	12.	adorare Deum	adorare Dominum *Orig. in Rom.*
422.	11.	*καὶ ἀγγελ. ὀνομάζειν*	*καὶ ἀπιέναι καὶ ἀγγελ. ὀνομ. Conc. Laod.*
427.	2.	*καὶ ταῦτα μὲν*	*καὶ ταῦτα φαμὲν Athan. apol.*
428.	14.	*ὅτι οὐ δεῖ*	*ὅτι οὐ χρὴ Conc. Trull.*
428.	4.	*παρασαλεύων*	*σαλεύων Conc. Trull.*
429.	3.	cum tremore	cum timore *Cypr. ad Quir.*
493.	17.	Ἑλληνιστικῶς .... Ῥωμαϊκῶς	Ἑλληνιστικοῖς .... Ῥωμαϊκοῖς *Orig. c. Cels.*
442.	25.	judicium nostræ l.	indicium nostræ l. *Aug. de doct.*
448.	4.	nequam famil.	nequaquam famil. *Anselm.*
456.	6.	*γίνεται*	*γίνεται ἡμῖν Chrys. Gen.*
474.	10.	*πιστεύσαντες μάθωμεν*	*πιστεύσαντες μάθωσιν Athanas.*
476.	1.	in pane prophetes figuravit	in panem prophetes nunciavit *Tert. adv. Jud.*
480.	13.	cum discipulis participavit	cum apostolis participavit *Cypr.*
480.	19.	de extrema unctione	de unctione chrismatis *Cypr.*
502.	15.	excommunicari præc.	excom. illos præc. *Microl.*
502.	12.	abstineret	abstinerent *Id.*
513.	8.	*ταύτας*	{ *ταύτας ed Par.* { *αὐτὰς Bever. Synod.* } *Balsam.*
537.	4.	quisquam	quisquis *Conc. Tolet.*
538.	4.	clara voce prædicetur	voce clara a populo decantetur *Ib.*
538.	3.	fides vera manifesta sit et testimonium habeat	fides vera manifestum testimonium habeat *Ib.*
540.	7.	Galliciæ	Galliæ *Ib.*
558.	33.	the same oath	the said oath *Adm. Eliz.*
558.	31.	divine offices	divine service *Ib.*
558.	23.	all persons	all manner of persons *Ib.*
558.	23.	nomen assumpsit, nec uti consensit	nomine uti consensit *Greg. V.* 20.
590.	4.	*μεγαλοπόλεως καὶ μ. τοῦτον*	*μεγαλοπόλεως ἀριθμείσθω θρόνος· εἶτα ὁ τῆς Ἀντιοχέων· καὶ μετὰ τ. Conc. Trul.* c. 36.
609.	11.	si et modo possit	et si modo velit et si modo possit. *Tert.*
609.	4.	ac pupillis	ac puellis. *Ib.*